The Westminster review

THE

WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

JULY TO DECEMBER
(INCLUSIVE)
1906.

"Truths can never be confirmed enough,
Though doubts did ever sleep."
SHAKESPEARE.

VOL. CLXVI.

LONDON:
E. MARLBOROUGH AND CO.
51 OLD BAILEY, E.C.
MDCCCCVI.

ANNEX A

INDEX.

THE

WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

VOL. CLXVI. No. 1.—JULY 1906.

THE MONTH.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

Toll for the Brave!

MICHAEL DAVITT—Fenian, Land Leaguer, Home Ruler, inveterate foe of English tyranny, but tried and trusted friend of the English democracy, ardent Nationalist and honest patriot, but true democrat, and therefore most truly cosmopolitan—is dead. Toll for the brave! Michael Davitt saw more clearly than any of Ireland's other leaders that the Irish question is at the bottom the land question. He saw clearly that not only the Irish question, but the Scotch question, the Welsh question, and "the condition of England question," also, are at the root the land question; and therefore he sought always to unite the democracies of England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales in a combined attack upon landlordism, their common enemy. Unlike too many of the Irish leaders, Michael Davitt, a personal friend and warm admirer of Henry George, stood, not for buying out, but for taxing out the landlords. Had his advice been followed, instead of uniting with the late Tory Government, to promote a land-purchase scheme under which, if it be fully carried out, the Irish landlords will receive some fifty millions more than the true market value of what they are pleased to call "their" land, the Irish Party would have made common cause with those who in this country and in Scotland are demanding the taxation of land values. Land purchase enormously inflates land values, and therefore makes it more difficult for would-be land-users to secure land. But the taxation of land values forces down rents and prices, and thus makes the land more readily obtainable. Under the late Government's scheme the peasantry are called upon

to pay impossible sums for their scanty, uneconomic holdings of bog land or rocky mountain side, while the rich grazing lands from which their forefathers were driven remain untouched, little or nothing has been done for the evicted tenants, nothing whatever for the millions of Irish labourers, and nothing whatever for the town-dwellers of Ireland. The taxation of land values, on the other hand, would, as in the Colonies, tend to break up the big grazing runs, thus enabling the peasants to extend their holdings, and the labourers to obtain a footing on their native soil. It would, if the tax were a substantial one, make the landlords anxious to come to terms with the evicted tenants; and it would automatically give fixity of tenure and security for improvements to tenants both in town and country. And all this, not only at no cost to the State, but while yielding to the public exchequer funds which would permit of the repeal of the more burdensome of the present rates and taxes. Happily signs are by no means wanting that the Irish people are beginning to realise the futility and folly of land purchase, and are awakening to the necessity for the true, the radical remedy, and this awakening is in large part due to the untiring zeal of Michael Davitt.

True Lover of Ireland.

What manner of man he was is shown by the instructions given in his will in regard to his diaries. A strenuous fighter, he held strong clear-cut views in regard to men and things, and never feared to give expression to those views; but of his diaries he says, "My diaries are not to be published as such, and in no instance without my wife's permission, but on no account must anything harsh or censorious written in the said diaries by me about any persons dead or alive who have ever worked for Ireland be printed, published, or used, so as to give pain to any friend or relative." So great was his love for Ireland that work done for Ireland was ever the surest passport to his heart. His concluding words are: "To all my friends I leave kind thoughts; to my enemies the fullest possible forgiveness; and to Ireland the undying prayer for the absolute freedom and independence which it was my life's ambition to try and obtain for her."

True Friend of Freedom.

But he loved "freedom and independence," not for Ireland only, but for all lands. He was the true friend of freedom the wide world over. Hence his sympathies at once went out to the Boers in the late regrettable war. He saw that the real issue at stake was not that of Briton versus Boer, but of the democracy of South Africa, British and Boer and Black against the monopolistic tyranny of the Randlords. And that Michael Davitt was right, and the great majority

of our countrymen wrong, few will now deny. His love of freedom for all lands is illustrated also by his attitude on the Education Act of 1902. Speaking at Battersea[1] in support of the candidature of Mr. John Burns, ever a true friend to Ireland, Davitt said: "There are thirty people who are Protestants in England and Wales to one who is a Catholic. The schools of England are necessarily Protestant in an overwhelming majority. Popular education in England is a Home Rule issue for England and Englishmen as much as Home Rule itself and Irish education in Ireland are national issues with us across the sea. The principle is the same." He urged that they ought to recognise the wishes of the majority of the people of England and Wales, and he pointed out that the fact that the "Catholics in England, who are overwhelmingly *Irish*," had "taken active sides in this English Protestant *conflict*," had "aroused again in this country the old, hateful, anti-Catholic feeling which was so rampant in England when I was a boy half-a-century ago." "In my humble opinion," he added, "this policy of taking sides, and of taking the class side against the popular side, was a huge mistake, fruitful of great injury to the Catholic faith itself, and a most deadly one in its effects upon the fortunes of the Home Rule cause." There spoke the true statesman, the true Catholic, the true democrat, the true Home Ruler, the true lover of right and justice, irrespective of race or creed. His brave heart is still in death, but the spirit of Michael Davitt lives for ever; and the cause of freedom, which he held so dear and for which he fought so long and so well, lives on and must triumph in the end.

We have to record the loss of another great personality by the "King Dick," sudden death, at the age of sixty-one, of the Right Hon. R. J. Seddon. Engineer, gold-digger, publican, and politician, his was indeed a strenuous career. A tribune of the people, he entered the New Zealand Parliament in the late seventies of last century, and in 1891 he became a member of the Liberal Labour Ministry then formed by the Hon. John Ballance. It was this Ministry which, as we have repeatedly shown, abolished the Tory Property Tax, and substituting for it a tax on land values, saved New Zealand from a great financial crisis, turned the tide of emigration into a tide of immigration, and set the Colony on the high road to prosperity and plenty. On the death of Mr. Ballance, in 1893, Mr. Seddon took the reins, and for no less than thirteen years he remained Premier of New Zealand and unchallenged leader of the Liberal Party. A practical politician rather than an idealist, he possessed great force of character; and this it was, combined with his Parliamentary generalship, his hard work, his large

[1] December 12, 1905.

measure of genuine democratic sympathy, and his bluff geniality, that was responsible for the long political reign of "King Dick." Probably no other man in the Colony could have held the Liberal Party together for half the time. And the Colony owes him a great debt of gratitude for holding the post for so long against the reactionary forces, and preventing their again undoing, as in 1879, the great work of Ballance and Grey. Other leaders might have wrecked the Party by attempting a more heroic policy, or, on the other hand, they might have estranged the advance-guard by showing less initiative.

Opportunist, but Reformer.

With a great faculty for accurately estimating public and political opinion, Mr. Seddon knew how far it was possible to go, and he was always ready with measures for the day. This may partake of opportunism, but it has accomplished much, and enriched the progressive record of the Colony. His bold action in coming to the support of the Bank of New Zealand during the great Australian bank crisis of 1893 will long be remembered to his credit and to that of his Ministry. He shares also with his Cabinet the credit of forcing through, though thrice rejected by the Lords, the Rating of Unimproved (Land) Values Bill, of extending the franchise to women, and of establishing Old Age Pensions. In spite of his old association with "the trade," Mr. Seddon carried through much temperance legislation, and his Ministry has done much in the direction of social reform, some of it of a decidedly Socialistic character. Of late years Mr. Seddon's health had caused his friends considerable anxiety, and his medical adviser had told him that he ought to take a rest from his labours. But he preferred to continue at work, and he has died, as he would wish to have died, in harness, his life's work crowned by the magnificent victory which returned him to power for the fifth and last time with a majority of three to one over Independents and Conservatives together. His successor in the Premiership will be Sir John Ward, and it is hoped that in the course of the necessary reconstruction the Cabinet will receive an infusion of Single Tax blood, and that, as a consequence, still further steps will be taken in the direction of the taxation and rating of land values. It is interesting to note in this connection that the Home Government, doubtless with an eye to legislation in the near future, has requested the New Zealand Government to supply them with information as to the results that have followed from land value rating and taxation in that Colony. With those results our readers are already familiar.

Chinese Slavery Continues.

His Majesty's Government hardly appear to realise the depth and bitterness of the feeling in this country, in South Africa, and throughout the Empire generally, in regard to Chinese slavery in South Africa. It is utterly absurd for Mr. Winston Churchill, the inventor of the "terminological inexactitude," to contend that the fact that only a score or so of coolies have taken advantage of the repatriation proclamation shows that the Chinese miners are contented with their lot. The steady increase in the number of desertions at once disposes of any such pretence. And, even if the slaves of the Randlords were content, that could not be held to justify slavery in a British Colony—or anywhere else, for the matter of that. The proclamation issued by Lord Selborne was simply a proclamation *pour rire;* and with scorn and laughter the House of Commons greeted it when read out by the Under Secretary for the Colonies. The late Government betrayed the people of this country and the people of our Colonies when, as a result of the war in South Africa, they introduced Chinese slavery into the Transvaal. And an uncomfortable feeling is gaining ground that the present Government, despite their election pledges, are practically continuing that betrayal. However, they will not be allowed to pursue such a policy in peace, and we are glad to know that a strong anti-slavery party is being organised in the House of Commons to force a prompt and proper settlement of this vital issue.

Repatriate Lord Selborne.

We were pleased to see that Lord Coleridge, when called upon to speak at the great social function held in honour of Ministers at the National Liberal Club,[1] did not hesitate even on such an occasion to deal faithfully with the Government in regard to this matter. It is no time to "prophesy smooth things"; and his lordship, roundly declaring that "those friends were most loyal who spoke with most plainess," said that "he should not be telling the truth if he did not say that there was in the party a sense of disappointment that more had not been done to fulfil the distinct pledges of the Government with respect to South Africa." He hit the nail squarely on the head when he added that "among the difficulties of the Government was the fact that they had in South Africa unwilling agents. Their agents must either be loyal and willing or be supplanted by those who would be so." And, following the line taken in these notes last month, he said, "Let the Cabinet carry into practical effect the speech of Mr. Churchill on February 22. Until that was done the position of the Government would not be so strong as its friends wished it to be." This is, indeed, the only

[1] June 15, 1906.

honest line to take. The disgrace of Chinese slavery must be swept away, and the coolies must be repatriated, even if, as a first step, it be necessary to repatriate Lord Selborne himself.

Russian Methods in India.

Nor is it only in South Africa that the Government has unwilling agents. The same evil influences are to be found at work in our greatest dependency, India. The worship of the great Imperial fetish "Continuity," has resulted in the perpetuation of the insane partition of Bengal, and, instead of the country being governed on the much-vaunted but too little practised British principles of justice and fair play, Russian methods have been adopted to the extent of suppressing meetings and processions, and prohibiting the use of the cry "Hail Motherland!" This is not as it should be; and if Mr. John Morley has any real regard for Liberal principles, if, indeed, he has any regard for his own fair fame as Secretary of State for India, he must see to it that those concerned in the administration of India shall either be loyal and willing agents of the Home Government or go and make way for agents who will be loyal and willing. And, while we are dealing with Mr. Morley, we would say that from a man of his high moral standing one would have expected a much more definite and outspoken declaration in regard to the opium traffic, forced in such criminal fashion and for sordid revenue purposes alone, upon the Chinese Empire. The opium traffic is a bold, bare enormous wrong. It is absolutely unjustifiable, and whatever the attitude of China may or may not be, we for our part should cease to enforce and to profit by the wrong. True, it means the loss of three to four millions sterling of revenue, and our Hindoo fellow subjects can bear no more taxation. But if the Imperial charges now borne by India were borne, as they should be, by the Imperial Exchequer, and if, also, the extravagant military expenditure of India were kept within bounds, not only could the opium revenue be spared, but the burdens that now oppress the starving millions of India could also be very materially reduced; while, as we have frequently pointed out, still greater relief is to be found by the proper assessment and just taxation of the land values of India. The ryot is now over assessed and over-taxed, but the big landholders, especially in the great centres of population go, comparatively speaking, scot free. This condition of India question cannot with safety be ignored any longer. The burdens now borne by India's poor, burdens that result in chronic famine and pestilence, must be greatly and speedily reduced, and steps must forthwith be taken to gradually democratise the government of India, both local and general, or "the British Raj" will fall, and great will be the fall thereof.

But this is a digression. Let us return to South Africa and its problem of Chinese slavery. The Home Government has failed to solve that problem, and it is apparent that its solution is to be left to the new Legislature which is about to be set up in the Transvaal. In this connection everything practically depends upon the franchise upon which that Legislature is to be elected. Manhood suffrage, with the constituencies apportioned in accordance with the number of voters, would give the preponderance of power to the floating element of the population in the mines and the great centres, who are peculiarly subject to pressure from the Rand magnates. This was, therefore, in the main, the course favoured by the late Government, who naturally desired to "safeguard and protect their friends"; and for that reason, if for no other, it is a course to be avoided by the present Government, which cannot desire to continue the control of the Randlords in the colony. The alternatives are to apportion the constituencies in accordance with population, or to grant adult suffrage; and the latter is the more logical course, though, unfortunately, recent happenings in this country render it very unlikely that that course will be followed. This is the more to be regretted, as adult suffrage would turn the balance of voting power from the Rand to the rest of the Transvaal. The returns issued some time ago showed that the number of Parliamentary voters on the Rand would be 46,203, and in the rest of the colony 42,120. This, presumably on the basis laid down by the late pro-Randlord government. So that it is clear that adult suffrage, by giving votes to the women as well as to the men, would completely turn the scale. And this would only be just. For it is the people who live their lives in a country, not the floating population, here to-day and gone to-morrow, that should direct the destinies of the country; and in the Transvaal, with its unjust food taxes, and the peculiar dangers to women, arising from the presence of wandering Chinese deserters, the claim of the womenfolk to the franchise is, as we have said before, exceptionally strong. However, whatever course the Government adopts, it must at least see to it that the franchise is such as to put the democracy, not the Randocracy, in command of the Transvaal.

Randocracy *versus* Democracy.

The claim that the Rand should rule because the gold mining industry is the great industry of South Africa, and its prosperity means the prosperity, and its ruin the ruin, of all the rest will not hold water. As a matter of fact, South Africa is ruined, and it is the gold mines that have ruined South Africa. But for the gold mines there would have been no war and no Chinese slavery. There might not have been so much "progress," nor so much wealth, but there would

The Way Out.

have been less corruption, what wealth there was would have been more fairly divided, there would have been no great poverty, and the minds of the people would not have been diverted from those industries which were in existence long before gold was discovered, and which must in the nature of things continue to exist long after the gold mines have been exhausted. Gold mines, and diamond mines too, for the matter of that, are even at the best by no means an unmixed blessing to a country, and where, as on the Rand, they are monopolised by an unscrupulous gang of exploiters, they became almost an unmixed evil. But the gold is there, and the problem is how to make the best of the position. To do this the mineral wealth of the Transvaal, which, as the minority report of the Labour Commission declared, belongs to the people of the Transvaal, and not to the foreign investor, should be worked in the interests of all, not in the interests of the few. The Chinamen must go, and the mines must be worked by white and by Kaffir labour. The Rand-lords complain that the cost of living is so high that they cannot employ white labour. A difficulty they do not mention is the extravagant over-capitalisation, over-" watering " of the mines. By taxing Rand values and other land values in the Transvaal the " water " would be squeezed out of mining stocks, and the revenue raised by such taxation would admit of the abolition of the present taxes on food, clothing, and other necessaries, while the land tax would further operate to force idle land into use, and thus not only open up the country to British settlers, but also still further reduce the cost of living by promoting house-building and lowering the present excessive rentals. We trust that the Legislature about to be formed will lose no time in setting to work on some such lines as those here laid down.

A General Election next Spring!

Mr. Chamberlain's prophecy of a General Election next spring has been treated with the contempt that it deserved. His invitation to the House of Lords to precipitate an appeal to the country by the rejection of the Education Bill, for that is what his speech amounted to, has been met by the Duke of Devonshire with the curt admonition that he should mind his own business, and Lord James of Hereford has implored the peers to think twice ere they set at nought the clearly expressed will of the people. The recent General Election, indeed, has notified all whom it may concern that the democracy of this country is not to be trifled with. The more far-seeing of the clerics are advising their less wide-awake fellows that any factitious refusal to accept the mandate of the people in regard to the Education Bill can but precipitate the issue of Church Disestablishment, and some of the peers, too, recognise that if the disestablishment movement once gets under way it is not the

Church alone that will be disestablished. The House of Lords has already challenged Labour by rejecting the Aliens Amendment Bill which would forbid the importation of aliens as strike-breakers. But even the Trades Union Branch of the Tariff Reform League is up in arms about it, and it seems probable that Lord Ridley (President of the Tariff Reform League), who moved the rejection of the Bill, may shortly reintroduce the measure and secure its acceptance.

Peers *versus* People.

It is, of course, possible, though hardly probable, that the House of Lords may seek to force a dissolution by rejecting leading Government measures. But that the Government should play into their hands by dissolving prematurely is unthinkable. The Government should not even consider *in the* drafting of the measures they bring forward the prejudices and predilections of the House of Lords. As Lord Coleridge said in the speech already quoted: "The House (of Lords) . . . is not nearly so formidable as we are apt to think." "I would not let them imagine," advised his lordship, "by any act of weakness in the Lower House that the Government was afraid of the House of Lords. He had a rooted opinion that the straight man, the bold man wins in the end, and he did not believe that there was anything to be gained by compromises. And with regard to the Education Bill, he gave the Government a word of warning. He hoped they would display no weakness in the face of clamour, from whatever quarter it might arise; and he did not believe that any action of the Government with a view to propitiating the House of Lords would be successful or statesmanlike." "*Toujours l'audace*" should be the motto of the Government. The electorate have given them a huge majority, and in spite of what the House of Lords may do, with such a majority, "with such a splendid instrument," as Mr. Haldane terms it, "it will"—to use the War Minister's own phrase —"be the fault of the Ministry if they do not achieve something."[1] With financial reform the Lords have no right to interfere, and even if their lordships should venture to reject all other measures the Government should press forward real live financial reforms on the lines repeatedly advocated in these notes, and then, and not till then, having done what they can in spite of the Lords, they may appeal with confidence to the democracy for a mandate to settle once for all the long outstanding account between peers and people. The House of Lords must go. Let the referendum, a direct appeal to the will of the people, take its place.

[1] National Liberal Club, June 15.

Democracy v. Plutocracy and v. Autocracy.

All the world over the rights of the people have yet to be won, but everywhere the battle is joined, and in the long run—but how long a run who shall say—right must triumph. Here the issue is hardly in doubt, the forces of reaction have suffered a crushing defeat. In our colonies the case is even better. But in the United States the fight against plutocracy, entrenched behind its Tariff walls, will be long and severe. The Beef Trust scandals recently exposed by Mr. Upton Sinclair and by official reports will do much to quicken the movement against the Trusts as a whole, but the economic awakening of a people is a slow process, and there is danger that if that process be too long delayed, revolution rather than evolution may result. For in the meantime the people are starving, and starvation is the stuff that revolutions are made of. That this danger is very real is shown by the bomb outrage on the occasion of the Spanish royal marriage. Thanks again to Protection and to land monopoly, the same twin evils that are oppressing America, the Spanish people are stricken with famine, and being denied a proper constitutional outlet for their feelings, and proper constitutional methods of redressing their grievances, recourse is too often had to the bomb and the assassin's knife. Nothing but justice and freedom can avail to put matters right, and happily the young king and his advisers seem inclined to act on such lines rather than to make things worse by a policy of reaction and repression. In Russia, on the other hand, the Czar and his Government are pursuing, with the worst possible results, a contrary course. The Duma is completely ignored, and brutal tortures, wholesale executions, Jewish massacres, and the starvation of the peasantry, by denying to them the land without which they cannot live, would seem to be preparing the way for a cataclysm too horrible to contemplate. The Duma, however, is acting with wonderful self-control; even if it be suppressed, its members declare that they will continue to meet elsewhere, and so long as this directing head is not lost to the people the position is not absolutely without hope.

THE DISCREDITED PESSIMISTS.

If the soundness of a stateman's policy may be better measured by the mental calibre of his followers than by their numerical strength, there should be little difficulty in determining the true worth of Mr. Chamberlain's economics.

The problem, *in* that case, admits of an easy solution. For, throughout the *discussions* of the past three years, there has been no more significant and conspicuous factor than the consistently maintained attitude, in regard to Mr. Chamberlain's proposals, of the great majority of those who, by intellect and training, are best fitted to weigh the merits of the momentous issue he has raised.

Almost without exception, the leading authorities upon both the theoretical and the practical aspects of the fiscal problem have ranged themselves in direct opposition to the suggested reversal of our commercial system. Very early in the controversy, indeed, fourteen of the most eminent professional economists subscribed to a vigorously worded protest, upon theoretical grounds, against the reintroduction in any form of protective or preferential tariffs; and it soon became evident that the academic view was nearly unanimously upheld by those experienced in the practical bearings of the question, as, for instance, the great financial authorities, including the present Chancellor of the Exchequer and most of his predecessors, the bankers, and the Trade Union leaders also.

Mr. Chamberlain, indeed, stands practically alone. He has with him not one name in the first rank of economics, of finance, nor even of politics; for the half-hearted and vacillating support of the ex-Premier (Mr. Chamberlain's sole sympathiser with any claim to the title of statesman), tempered as it is by that hazy, diffident scepticism which emasculates all Mr. Balfour's opinions, carries as little weight intellectually as it has has hitherto carried politically.

Who then, we may ask, are Mr. Chamberlain's followers, and by virtue of what mental or other qualifications do they dismiss expert solutions of abstruse economic problems, and oppose the matured convictions of experienced authorities upon practical commercial issues?

Probably we shall do the great majority of tariff reformers no injustice if we suspect that their sense of the intellectual responsibility involved in their attitude weighs but lightly upon their minds. With Mr. Chamberlain, indeed, to lead the revolt against authority,

who, they may exclaim, need fear to follow? None too soon, an enlightened statesman of commanding ability has realised the urgency of defying established opinion, and of directing public attention to national perils which should have been obvious to every one years ago. And besides, they may declare, further, that though in this country the weight of authority is undeniably against them, yet, taking the world at large, the reverse is the case—Great Britain, Holland, and New South Wales being almost the only anti-Protectionist civilised States.

In other words, then, the Tariff Reformers' defence may be said to run thus: In the first place it is wiser to rely, for the solution of an economic problem, upon the judgment of a politician who has contradicted himself upon nearly every public question that has arisen during the course of his career, rather than to trust the well-nigh unanimous opinion of life-long students of the subject. Secondly, regarding the balance of authority between Free Trade and Protectionist States, it is safer to appeal to the decision of the chiefly unsuccessful majority rather than to that of the wholly successful minority—to the great Protectionist concert, that is to say, which includes all the more backward nations (and the leading exceptions to whose general lack of commercial success are found where, as in the cases of the United States and Germany, over considerable areas the opposite principle prevails), rather than to the small Free Trade group, composed without exception of States conspicuous for their commercial success.

But we must avoid the error of charging the typical Tariff Reformer with all the logical implications of his admissions. We should bear in mind that he is the irredeemably insular patriot first, the cautious political thinker last.

Nothing, for example, better illustrates his characteristic outlook than a glance at his habitual conception of the process by which international trade is carried on. Ever present to his loyal imagination is the rousing picture of the plundering foreigner, persistently invading the British market, flooding the country with his alluringly cheap productions, and undermining, with full permission of both Parliament and people, the foundations of British industry.

To judge from the constant direction of Tariff Reformers' arguments, this haunting vision would actually appear to express, for many of them, the whole concrete operation of the abstract doctrine of free importation; and labouring, as they apparently do, under a constitutional inability to take a larger and more comprehensive view of the phenomena of international commerce, facts and arguments alike usually avail nothing to repel their obsession.

Of all such elementary economic truths as that imported foreign goods must inevitably be paid for by exported home-made goods, that, therefore, the greater the quantity of imports the greater

must be the quantity of exports, and, consequently, the greater the employment of home labour, in their manufacture, scarcely a suspicion seems ever to be caught by the average Tariff Reformer.

He rarely betrays, even, the faintest consciousness of the necessarily reciprocal character of the benefits to be derived from foreign trade. That, for instance, the net effect of raising prices of commodities now imported by insisting upon their home production must be to compel the British consumer to work longer in order to earn wages of the same purchasing power as at present; and that, therefore, the policy of free importation is the one fiscal system under which the highest available remuneration is secured to home labour; are aspects of the problem he professes to study that seem never to disturb the easy confidence with which he undertakes its solution.

All such far-*fetch*ed theorising, indeed, Tariff Reformers serenely ignore.

Nor is the limitation of their outlook confined to the purely theoretical elements of the question. On a par with their disregard of established and verifiable doctrine is their consistent contempt for all officially attested statistical evidence.

Though with each publication of the Board of Trade returns to date, the volume, both of our export and of our import trade, is seen to have risen above all previously recorded figures, yet Tariff Reformers continue to bewail unceasingly our rapidly approaching commercial doom.

And though the total annual value of German commerce is but £500,000,000, compared with Great Britain's total of £800,000,000; and the Foreign Office reports upon the trade of the German Empire prove that, in spite of the much-vaunted relative expansion of German in comparison with British commerce, the growth of British exports during the past ten years has exceeded by 25 per cent. per head of the population (the only true standard of comparison) the growth of German exports during the same period; yet Tariff Reformers never tire of drawing comparisons between German and British success in the race for the world's trade, to the invariable discredit of their own country.

And notwithstanding that pauperism has declined from 7 per cent. to 2 per cent. since the adoption of Free Trade, and that labour market returns show a decrease in the number of unemployed from 7 per cent. to a fraction under 4 per cent. during the past four years, we still hear these pessimistic students of national progress clamouring in despair for an immediate commercial revolution to stem the rising flood of pauperism and unemployment!

But figures make little appeal to the imagination! It is enough for Mr. Chamberlain's ardent disciples that they can picture, with the aid of his vivid powers, an ever-swelling multitude of helpless

fellow-countrymen reduced to the verge of destitution and starvation by unscrupulous foreign competition. Utterly oblivious to the magnitude of the general injury inflicted upon the whole community by protecting the home producer from open competition, they appreciate nothing but the individual effect of exposure to such competition. And, blind to the obvious truth that by compelling consumers to pay higher than needful prices the collective wealth of the nation must be diminished by the equivalent, at least, of such compulsory waste, they naïvely dream of increasing employment throughout the country by thus decreasing the capital by which industry is supported, and whereby, as a necessary consequence, employment is promoted.

Such, indeed, are but a few of the more grotesque vagaries of thought which have recently been masquerading as economic science, and striving to obtain recognition in the national polity.

But why concern ourselves further with amateur economics based upon no recognisable data? Why listen to the no-longer heeded vaticinations of a faction upon whose tenets the nation has already pronounced its unequivocal opinion?

For the Tariff Reform movement has received its quietus. Brilliantly conceived, vigorously conducted, and cunningly engineered as it has been, it has collapsed as completely as, before the judgment of a level-headed race, all such hollow agitations must inevitably collapse.

The nation has accorded Mr. Chamberlain a generous hearing. It has fully weighed his arguments and thoroughly sifted his facts, and, finding both sadly wanting, has never for one moment been imposed upon by either.

The country which, almost alone among nations, has had the political foresight and the philosophic acumen to establish its commercial system upon a profoundly logical basis, whose validity is continuously vindicated by her maintenance of the commercial supremacy of the world, is scarcely likely to commit commercial suicide by reverting, at this time of day, to that antiquated and discredited policy, born of slipshod reasoning and unenlightened patriotism, which still hampers progress in so many countries.

Ignominiously, however, as this Titanic effort to revive long-exploded fallacies has failed politically, psychologically it has not proved unilluminating.

More, perhaps, than any other incident in an unsteady career will the Tariff Reform campaign, its tone and conduct, serve to shape the final estimate to be formed by thoughtful minds of its gifted leader's character, his mental powers, and the use he made of them.

ADRIAN RICHMOND.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM.

II. Registration.

Last October the Westminster Review was good enough to insert an article by me on Parliamentary Reform. The announcement of a Bill by the present Government for dealing with the question of Plural Voting and Universal Suffrage has prompted me to contribute a second paper on the subject to your valuable magazine. What the fate of the Government Bill may be, when it reaches the Lords, it is premature to forecast, nor can I say whether "Honourable Reformers" will be successful in this connection; but, assuming that the time has not yet arrived for universal adult suffrage, I propose, therefore, to examine instead the merits of a general scheme for including such franchise reforms as appear practicable, and which have been considered necessary in the opinion of certain authorities, including, in some cases, those of Revising Barristers.

Since writing the bulk of this article, however, a debate has taken place in the House of Commons on the second reading of the Plural Voters' Bill, and, although there was not on that occasion much matter discussed relative to the subject of this article, still it may be convenient to refer to one or two statements made at that sitting. For example, it was clearly brought out that the franchise at the present day has a local, rather than a territorial, value—that is to say, that it refers rather to the locality than to the ownership of land, in particular; and this was held by some as sufficient reason for granting a person the franchise in various divisions. A somewhat similar remark may be held to apply to the representation ilself, which may be said to be, in the same way, local rather than corporate, for, with the exception of the Universities, all members now, or at the last Redistribution Bill did, represent similar areas of population. This point will probably be debated at the next Redistribution Bill, when the nine University seats come up for consideration. Meanwhile, in default of the Plural Voters' Bill passing unscathed through the Lords, the following article is offered as the basis of an alternative Bill, which, as being rather of an enfranchising than of a disfranchising nature, is suggested as possibly more acceptable to all parties. As already stated by me, however, registration was little touched upon in a debate of several hours.

One or two points, however, were brought out. It appears, for instance, that, north of the Tweed, the registration laws differ somewhat from the English ones, and one member stated that this created some confusion. Could they not, therefore, be made to harmonise more? Again, Mr. Ward, the (Labour) member for Stoke-on-Trent, touched on what is, after all, the real *crux* of the registration question, viz., the shortening of the qualification period, which has been somewhat, though not substantially, relaxed since the first Registration Act of 1832. Another member referred, in a vigorous speech, to the old theory of taxation and representation going together, which, for better or for worse, has long ceased to be the case, unless, indeed, paying indirect taxes (which every one does) can be called taxation. The only other point in registration that I noticed was the complaint that a number of persons' names were allowed on the register long after they were deceased.

To resume. Stated briefly, the history of the Reform question may be thus summarised:

(1) Previous to the reign of William IV., the franchise was almost entirely confined to the landed classes, viz., to freeholders in the counties, and, in the boroughs, to freeholders and freemen, as well as to a few faggot voters in both.

(2) The Bill of 1832 (broadly speaking) may be said to have enfranchised the commercial and middle classes.

(3) The Bill of 1867 enfranchised the artisans, and that of 1884 the agricultural labourers.

Now there are many persons who, perhaps, would not have felt inclined to support the first two Bills, but who, now that the suffrage is an accomplished fact, can see no earthly reason for a lengthened time test for residential qualification. It seems too much like giving the vote with one hand and taking it away with the other. A man does not necessarily become any the wiser, wealthier, or better educated, simply because he always remains under the same roof for a lengthened period. And it must be candidly admitted that all the revolutionary terrors of an enlarged franchise have long since passed away. Considering that in the towns the British workman has had the vote for over thirty-eight years, it cannot be said that he has been in any great hurry to use it democratically. Influences, doubtless, there have been that have held him back from hitherto asserting his rights, but he, certainly, has done so in the recent General Election to a far greater extent than ever before, and the Labour Party is now a power to be reckoned with. To this aspect of the subject I propose to allude later, but, in the meantime, I wish to refer, more particularly, to the registration court revisions, and, in this connection, the following points suggest themselves as affording illustrations of the

necessity for reform in this direction, the examples, I may add, being chiefly confined to the metropolis:

(1) The first point I would call attention to is in connection with catering. In St. George's, Hanover Square, some occupiers of unfurnished bachelors' chambers were in danger of being disfranchised, simply because the landlord appears to have catered for their breakfasts. The Revising Barrister, whilst agreeing as to the danger of disfranchisement in this particular, urged that, in any new Franchise Bill, the question under consideration should be made quite clear, and be freed from all ambiguity.

(2) The whole question of the service vote needs clearing up. At the last Registration Court at Finsbury, a case came up before the late Mr. Nepean, which must have affected a good many voters in different parts. Claims were made by two men, as superintendents of a tenement, known as Northampton Buildings, who resided on the premises, and whose rent was covered by their services. These men, the Revising Barrister said, claimed for a "dwelling-house successive," and they came from a place inside the county of London, and were on the "service" list. Unfortunately for themselves, however, they came from outside the borough of Finsbury, and the Revising Barrister was, therefore, compelled to disallow their votes. This limitation should undoubtedly be removed in the case of persons who are compelled, for their livelihood, to go and live in another house as caretakers.

(3) At Wandsworth a lodger came near to disfranchisement simply because he happened to be a friend of the landlord, and, therefore, although he paid the full rent entitling him to a vote, was not supposed to have paid his *actual share* of it as a lodger. The Revising Barrister, however, humorously remarked that it would be "unreasonable to assume that a man could not reside in a house without being an enemy of the landlord. It would never do for him (the Revising Barrister) to strike every lodger off the list who was on terms of friendship with his landlord." In this case the claim was allowed.

(4) It ought to be made quite clear that the rateable value of the premises should in no way enter into the question of a lodger's vote. At Tooting a claimant was objected to, although he had paid 4*s.* 6*d.* a week for unfurnished rooms, on the ground that the portion let could not be worth the qualifying sum of £10 per annum. The claimant, however, produced his rent book and the barrister allowed his vote.

(5) One of the objections to Universal Suffrage is, that it would include both criminals and lunatics, but at Preston (Lancs.) it appears that one of the latter has already got the franchise, as he happens to be a paying patient in a private asylum.

Let me say here that it ought to be clearly stated in the next Bill whether or not the rate-collector should call for the rates of those entitled to vote. At least, he should be compelled to leave a notice.

(6) At Berwick half a dozen householders were struck off the list as "Passive Resisters," though they seem to have stated, in each case, that they were willing to pay their rates to the collector if he called.

(7) The question of nightly tenants seems still to be left in considerable obscurity, and cases are continually transmitted to the High Courts from the Registration Courts for decision. It will, therefore, be necessary to establish some uniform rule for such cases, seeing that the opinions of the Revising Barristers are considerably at variance.

(8) The next question concerns foreigners, viz,, whether an alien, born on a British ship, is thereby to be considered as a British subject for electoral purposes, or whether it depends on the waters in which he is born, or whether his father was captain of the ship. In the last case it would seem that, if it was a British ship, that would be sufficient to entitle him to be considered a British subject. At Islington it was considered that the mere fact of a Dane having lived for a considerable number of years in the borough entitled him to the vote. The Barrister described it as a very puzzling case.

(9) A curious case occurred in St. Pancras, where a lodger who claimed the franchise did not appear to know his own name, nor did his wife know it. She only knew the name under which she was married to him, and that was the name under which he was registered. The claim in this case was disallowed.

The Fulham Registration Court supplies an instance of an alderman without a vote, he having been imprisoned in Wormwood Scrubbs as a "Passive Resister." This matter was strenuously contested. The Liberals contended that his imprisonment was voluntary, but the Revising Barrister humorously remarked that the alderman was absent by order of his Majesty. It is difficult to see the difference between this case and the next in the same court, where a "Passive Resister" was imprisoned for the non-payment of 10*d*. Here the Revising Barrister stated that the imprisonment was voluntary, and the vote was allowed, but he permitted a special case to be stated for the High Court.

In Eskdale the Revising Barrister held that a man who had been sent to prison for non-payment of rates, though only for twenty-four hours, had purged his liability, and he was, therefore, entitled to the vote.

(10) One of the hardest cases, however, and one that will require a thorough examination, is the case of men who, many of

them from no fault of their own, have been in receipt of parochial relief.

In Brixton sixty men, and at Kensington eighty men, were struck off the list, whilst in Bow and Bromley the number reached no less than 970.

(11) The distinction between lodgers and occupiers seems rather a nice one. At Lambeth some flats had been turned into lodgings, and a man was removed from the list of occupiers because he had become a lodger. Up to the last year the tenants were "occupiers," but during the qualifying period one of these flats became vacant, and the landlord resided in it for two months. By this means the other tenement holders became lodgers, and it was pointed out that a landlord, who held strong political views, could always thus change flats into lodgings, and thus disfranchise tenants. The Revising Barrister held, however, that it was a question of degree, and that, in this case, the lodgers must suffer and their claims be disallowed. This is one of those cases that ought to be carefully considered in any future Bill.

(12) There was a wholesale objection to lodgers at Woolwich on the ground that the claims had been improperly filled in. As a rule, of course, if the claimant, or the election agent, will not take the trouble to see that the register is properly filled up, the person claiming would be deservedly disfranchised. Generally, however, Revising Barristers permit technical mistakes to be amended. In this case seventy-six lodgers had improperly described themselves as joint tenants with the landlord. The Revising Barrister said it would be desirable to ascertain if this was a device for securing a vote. If the lodgers were found to be occupying only one room, the claims were bad. A typical case was taken, and one room was found to be furnished and the other unfurnished. Mr. Barefoot, the agent of the Labour Party, requested that the claim should be amended. The Conservative agent remarked that there were no mistakes of this kind before, and, in this case, they were very numerous. The Revising Barrister said he did not think he could allow any amendments to be made. He agreed, however, to defer his final decision, pending inquiries. A much harder case, however, was that in which objection was raised to twenty-six lodgers, simply because the month of the year had been inserted in another handwriting.

(13) In contradistinction to the above remarks the Revising Barrister for West Southwark stated that, in his opinion, owing to the loose way things were done, nearly every man of twenty-one could obtain a vote. He also incidentally remarked that many plural voters were under the impression that it was illegal to exercise more than one vote, and that they could be prosecuted for using the others.

(14) An amusing incident occurred at South Shields. A political agent objected to a lodger's vote on the grounds that the claimant was quite a boy. The Revising Barrister inquired if the youth had any hair on his face. It was proved that he had quite a promising moustache, and his vote was allowed.

(15) Incidentally, at Blackburn, the Revising Barrister advised all electors to examine the lists on the doors of churches and chapels in order to see that their names were on the register, and so not to leave the matter entirely in the hands of the party agents.

(16) The twenty-five mile radius. It has been suggested that this restriction should be sometimes extended to other cities. Either this should be so, or the offices should come under the ordinary property vote. In which latter case, of course, there need be no necessity to reside on the premises. In exchange for "the radius," an office might have the "property" qualification. An alderman of the City of London was disfranchised in respect of his City offices, though otherwise qualified, on the ground that he did not reside there. The "radius" rule is, of course, a relic of the Act of 1843. Under its ruling two gentlemen at least nearly lost their votes at the last registration. Both appear to have occupied rooms at hotels as their London residence. In the one case the question was raised as to how many rooms the elector occupied at the hotel, and, in the other, as to whether he was still residing in his rooms. These matters sometimes create great and unnecessary difficulties in the discovery.

(17) The removal of deceased voters from the lists should be simplified. The law at present appears to be that the deceased's name is left on the lists till objections are served at the revision of voters.

Mr. H. B. Edge, at South Paddington, very properly suggested that it should be sufficient to notify the overseers of the death in order that the name may be removed. In South Essex some difficulty was experienced in proving the deaths of two voters, and the name of one was left on the register. If the above suggestion was carried out, very few dead men would in future be polled.

(18) If a claimant's signature has not been attested at the time, it should be made clear in the next Bill whether or no it may be subsequently amended. It seems rather hard that a person, otherwise duly qualified, should have his name erased merely on this account. At present, however, the Revising Barrister has no choice in the matter.

(19) The need for further amendment in the lodger franchise was also demonstrated at Romford. The Revising Barrister there remarked that he had over and over again stated (as reported) that if he had proper evidence he should strike out nine out of every ten

of the lodger votes. A curious case occurred in this court. A freeholder claimed a vote for his premises, which had recently been destroyed by fire, though he was otherwise duly qualified, and appears previously to have voted for these same premises. It was naturally suggested in Court that a man could not vote for premises that did not exist. The Revising Barrister, however, very properly agreed to state a case for the High Court.

(20) There seems to be a traditional franchise attaching to canal shares. At Enfield an objection was lodged against forty-eight voters who held New River shares. I have not been able to discover what the verdict was, but the matter should be cleared up, and the vote confirmed in any future Bill (unless we are in for one man one vote), or a wholesale disfranchisement of electors seems likely.

(21) Perhaps the hardest case of all occurred at Staines, where a number of workmen residing at West Drayton were struck off the lists. During the previous winter, it appears, they had been working in some stoneyards opened by the Uxbridge Board of Guardians, and had been paid for their labour half in money and half in "kind." This (part) payment of wages in "kind" seems, under some relic of the old Poor Laws, still to constitute "relief," and it led to their disfranchisement, though their votes were opposed neither by the Conservative nor by the Liberal agent. Mr. Blake, the Revising Barrister, said his sympathies were entirely with the men, who, by stress of circumstance, had been compelled to accept this form of "relief": but the law was clearly against them, and he had no option in the matter.

(22) Constant inaccuracies, such as mis-spellings of names, wrong Christian names, and inaccurate dates, are naturally occurring in these Registration Courts. At Wimbledon the Revising Barrister held that this was in part the fault of the overseers, and, in this case, deducted £10 from his costs. This, surely, is a proof that many inaccuracies are bound to occur for which electors should not be disfranchised.

(23) The property franchise, though the oldest in existence, does not yet seem always to be quite settled, as the following extract from the *Daily Telegraph* will show! "Mr. F. Archer, representing the Conservative Party, successfully defeated several objections to ownership voters, and (in some cases) where voters were registered for land, on the ground that there was a qualifying value, quoting *Ashbury* v. *Henderson* in support."

(24) More power should be accorded in the new Acts to Revising Barristers to amend statements of claim. In the City Revision Court an Alderman's name was struck off because his private address was incorrectly given, and at Chiselhurst a man was struck off the list because he did not definitely locate the

position of the room for which he claimed. In each of these cases the Revising Barrister had no choice, but a clause might be inserted in the new Bill giving an unlimited power of amendment. In North Bucks., for example, there was a wholesale "massacre" of old lodgers on the ground that the amount of their rent was not properly stated (thus reported in the newspapers). It is to be feared that one result of this was to induce a large number of electors to vote against the party that proposed the disfranchisement of the men.

(25) If the members of a company owning water shares, such as the New River Company, are entitled to votes, why should not the members of a company owning property on dry land be so entitled? It was held at Wimbledon, however, that the latter were invalidated.

(26) A question has arisen as to eligibility for the franchise of those members of the Stock Exchange who are aliens—most of whom, apparently, are outside brokers—and it was determined at the last revision, after striking out their names, to leave to these persons themselves the onus of claiming for their restoration. It should be definitely settled, in any future Act, whether those aliens shall be eligible like any other members of the Stock Exchange.

(27) It seems to have been definitely settled in a recent case from Ireland that, where sons live with their parents "by agreement," and where this has been deliberately stated, the claim is good.

(28) From a case at Hoxton it would appear that the overseers do not object to a man retaining his vote after receiving parochial relief for a fortnight. This is a step in the right direction, and might be extended where enforced idleness is not the elector's own fault. On the other hand, a claim appears to have been allowed there to a man who had not paid the full value of his lodgings for the qualifying period. Surely, however, whatever the qualifying period is, it should be requisite that a man should have paid his full rent up to his full period; otherwise, a handle is inevitably given to those who would limit the suffrage. Clergy of all denominations living in a clergy house or college, should, in future, come under the service vote, as was shown at Wimbledon; and this should be made clear in any future Act.

(29) At Lancaster the Revising Barrister made it quite clear that a man has no vote, merely by reason of his being an official, apart from residence, as in the case of a Wesleyan minister who claimed a vote just because he held a licence, under the Marriage Act, to solemnise marriages.

(30) A case has been stated above in which persons were allowed the vote after receiving a fortnight's parochial relief, but, in some cases, as at Bethnal Green, voters were struck off simply because they had received one loaf of bread each. The Revising

Barrister was, doubtless, within his right, but these different cases should all be brought into line.

(31) It is strange that, in these days of education, electors can still be found who only can, or who only will, sign with a mark. Here the Revising Barrister stretched a point, and allowed the men to attend personally to prove their qualifications. In a similar case, at Bermondsey, the Revising Barrister made the excellent suggestion that these marks should always be accompanied by a stamp.

(32) A perfectly fair but rather hard case was mentioned at Battersea, where a lodger was disfranchised, though he had paid his rent, simply because his landlord had not paid the rates. On the face of it, it seems rather hard that the lodger should have to suffer for the delinquencies of his landlord.

(33) The question may be asked, Are a voter's rates paid (*e.g.*, a Passive Resister's) if some one else pays the whole or part of them? At Cleckheaton (Yorks.) the Revising Barrister held that they had been, but in a neighbouring division the same person held the contrary view. Cannot one rule be framed for all these cases? Then, further, Revising Barristers hold different views as to whether imprisonment does, or does not, discharge the rate.[1]

(34) Over and above the cases quoted, there would still seem to be a number of purely technical difficulties, as, for example, where an objector had failed to state in the required form the grounds of his objection. He was, no doubt, quite rightly required to do so, as the law stands at present, and yet his objections, such as they were, may have been perfectly valid.

It will, of course, be impossible to remove all these disqualifications in the next Bill, nor would it, perhaps be desirable to do so. Some of them, however, are particularly irritating, and are of a kind that give rise to calls for Manhood, or Universal, Suffrage, for it seems certain that the School Board vote—which is wider in the sense that it includes women voters—and the Borough and County Council franchise, are not nearly so often challenged as the Parliamentary one. Two of the most pressing are those dealing with outdoor, and with the "radius," restriction, and another is the service franchise; surely, this latter might be widened so as to include police constables occupying separate cubicles, and the cases of caretakers already mentioned. No Bill dealing with registration, at least in these days, should afford any ground for party animus. Once a man is duly qualified, Conservative and Liberal agents alike vie with each other in their endeavours to get him on the register. And, once on the register, both parties contend for the honour of

[1] It is only fair to add that the party agents have, in many cases, made no objection to voters out of employment receiving parochial relief. For example, some eighty names of such persons were allowed to remain on the list at Kennington, the Conservative agent stating that both sides had too much respect for the working-classes to object for so paltry a reason.

carrying him to the poll. But of all matters connected with Parliamentary registration, the most important—and one that is certain to be dealt with in the next measure on the subject—is the length of time required for residence. My attention was first called to this matter (and, in fact, to the whole subject of registration) by a correspondence that appeared in the *Standard* on the subject. One of these was so much to the point that I retained it. It is from the Reverend E. M. Townshend, Fellow of his College and member of the Cambridge University Senate.

This gentleman stated that it took him twenty-one years to obtain a vote, and two and a half years to obtain one in Monmouthshire, where his living is, after coming into residence. As he says, the present system of registration is ridiculous. The period necessary for residence might well be reduced to six months. A couple of months would amply serve for making up the register, and, as soon as the Courts are ended, the register should lie open again. In other words, with the exception of the two months required by the Courts, registration should be allowed all the year round, and not treated, as it is at present, as if it were a crime. "I feel confident," says Mr. Townshend, "that there are thousands more of educated University and other voters whose support ought to be invaluable to any Ministry, as intelligent voters whose occasional migration from one place to another, in the course of their professional employment, simply results in their disfranchisement." And all inquiries I myself have made in this connection bear out Mr. Townshend's statement. The public at large are quite unaware how many eligible persons of their own number are kept from voting by our obsolete Registration Laws, the "complete" reform of which should, many think, have preceded Parliamentary reform itself, or, rather, should have been the first item in it. There is no reason, for instance, as I pointed out in my first paper on this subject, why members of the House of Lords should not have a vote for Parliamentary candidates. No doubt, when the Upper House was the stronger of the two, it was considered that a voting power in that body was sufficient, but, as members of the Commons have, in addition to their vote in the House, got an extra Parliamentary vote, there seems to be no reason why the Peers should not also have one. In addition, moreover, to some measure of Franchise Reform, the time seems to be fast approaching when another Ballot Bill will have to be introduced dealing with the question of a second ballot, which most other countries, possessing a Parliament, have long since adopted. At the recent General Election the "cornered fights" (single constituencies) numbered thirty-nine. In these no less than twenty-four members were defeated that might have been returned—Liberals and Conservatives in almost equal proportions.

BYRON.

THE LAND AND UNEMPLOYMENT.

In this time of lack of employment for numbers of able-bodied men, the thoughts of the social reformer turn inevitably to a resettlement of our depopulated farming areas as affording the only solution of that problem. It is important that the public should appreciate the most just and effective way of bringing about such resettlement. For, by extravagant outlay in buying up estates on which to found labour colonies or small holding farms, the amount of the public debt might be so increased that the ill effects of its burden would outweigh the good to be derived from a reform in the land system. The purpose of this article is to point out the path reform should follow, and to show how, without injustice to any man, certain changes in our Land Laws would result in prosperity to the agricultural industry, the solution of the unemployment problem, a decrease in general taxation and an increase in the public revenue.

Let us first review very briefly the history of agricultural prosperity and depression, and notice the causes thereof.

From the earliest period of her history, in the days of the Roman occupation down to the middle of the sixteenth century, England was in a position not only to feed her people with home-grown grain, but also, save in times of famine brought about by invaders' devastations or other exceptional causes, to export quantities of it to Europe. During the succeeding hundred years, considered relatively to the increase in population, agriculture declined. From 1670 to 1846, bounties on home-grown corn and heavy import duties on foreign corn, gave to it an artificial stimulus at the expense of every other trade in the country. Since Sir Robert Peel's Act of 1846, abolishing the corn import duties, the industry has again declined. To-day, where agriculture might be giving employment to thousands of labourers, it gives employment to hundreds only; and the depopulation of the country districts is one of the principal contributing causes of the labour difficulty in the towns.

We may pass by without further notice the period of Protection —for Protection is an expensive means of stimulation of which no political economist can approve, and the reintroduction of which the country will never permit. We are then faced with the simple historical position that agriculture prospered down to the middle of

the sixteenth century, and afterwards—apart from artificial assistance—declined. To appreciate the causes of this decline, we must glance back to the days when feudalism was established in England. Previous to that time, and during that time, grain and fruit growing, wool-farming and cattle-raising were the usual occupations of the common people. It is true there were metal-workers, woollen manufacturers, and, later on, silk weavers and other producers; but these were few in number; and it is perfectly correct to say that at the period spoken of the permanent wealth of the country consisted of the produce from the surface of the land—above all, of the grain crops—and that most of the necessary manufactured articles (not a great number) were imported in exchange for exports of wool and grain. Now, since the national wealth lay in the land, its cultivation was a paramount necessity; and, however systematically the practice of sub-infeudation might shift the burden of cultivation from the head tenant to the under tenant, and so to the terre-tenant, who was the final occupier of the land, cultivation really did take place. Nor was it of any real importance whether the various tenants in alienating to under-tenants retained a portion of the land to cultivate for their own purposes, or parted with the whole to the terre-tenants in exchange for annual services or payments in kind. In either case self-interest would urge a diligent pursuit of the farming arts, giving rise to the employment of numerous villeins, or of free labourers, as villenage died out.

Towards the middle of the twelfth century commenced a practice of commuting the services, by performance of which owners held their lands of the king, for fixed money payments. Owing to its great convenience the practice was viewed with general approval and rapidly gained ground. This was to have extremely important results. When first calculated, the annual money payment would be regarded as a fair moderate rental for the land, and it continued to be so for more than three centuries, until, in fact, the discovery of the New World. Then the transference to Europe of shiploads of American gold and silver brought about a sudden diminution in the value of money; and while formerly the tenant had perforce to extract from the land all that it would yield in order to procure enough to pay his lord and leave something over for his own expenses, the new cheapening of money now made that payment a mere trifle, so that in later years it was discontinued. Further, the growth of trade during the middle ages had vastly increased the amount and value of personal property, and there was a tendency to raise the royal revenues by levying taxes upon it rather than upon realty. It was thus no longer necessary to produce from the land so much as in earlier days.

Another cause which contributed to the decline of agriculture was the growing demand on the Continent for English wool. Had

real property borne its proper share of taxation no evil would have resulted from this, for the owner would have been induced still to make the soil yield to him all that it could; sheep would have been grazed on the uplands, and the cultivation of corn continued in the lowlands. But, as observed above, the tendency was to tax personalty; and the landowner discovered that by turning his ploughed fields into sheep pastures, the property would yield nearly as large a revenue as in previous years without the necessity of employing so many labourers as cultivation demanded and without its attendant risk of bad harvests. The landowner had, in fact, discovered a source of income independent of cultivation.

It is exactly these two evils of an improper system of taxation and of the possession by landowners of independent incomes which are the main ultimate cause of the depressions of agriculture to-day. Wool-growing is not now the source of the latter, but its place is taken by an investment of the proceeds of a sale or lease of a portion of the land for mining and building purposes. Or in many cases a wealthy trader has bought up the land to use as a private park, with no intention of cultivating since he draws an ample revenue from his trading concern. The policy of these landowners is to preserve unspoilt the beauty of their estates in an untilled condition; they do so by declining to build new farmhouses and squeezing large rents from the tenants of those houses which are already in existence.

The existence of a third class of landowner is another cause contributing to the depression. He is the man of ancient family possessed of a large ancestral estate, in the soil of which no valuable minerals have been found, near which no town has sprung up, and over which no sport suitable for expensive disposal can be had. He has thus no income apart from the ordinary revenues from the farms. Previous family settlements have burdened the estate with accumulated portions, jointures, rent charges and other incumbrances. Family pride prevents him from selling the land; family pride bids him live in the mansion house in the style of his fathers. What is he to do for money? Again, let him squeeze the tenant farmer!

The result of all this is twofold:

In the first place, much of the land is wilfully kept out of cultivation—a deplorable economic waste.

In the second place, the land, where cultivated, cannot produce enough to satisfy the claims upon it. The tenant's few fields are expected to provide for the wages of the labourers, the food and clothing of the tenant and his family, their personal necessaries and education, the working expenses of the farm, direct and indirect taxation, local rates and duties; and, further, under the name of rent, to contribute towards the wages of the middlemen, bailiffs,

stewards and managers, the upkeep of the owner's costly establishment and his other expenses, the payment of tithes, the jointures of former widows of the house, the portions of younger children, the rent charges, the interest on loans raised by mortgage! What wonder can there be that the young men who have seen their fathers beaten by these difficulties hurry away from their village homes to the towns.

But this is not all. The feudal lord, even in the twentieth century, is still the feudal lord, and his vassals must be put in such a position that terrible punishment may follow disobedience to his wishes. So the farmer is made a tenant at will, liable to be ejected on the shortest notice; and though even then the farmer is entitled to reap such crops as he has sown, he is deprived on ejection of the compensation (given by the Agricultural Holdings Act) for his more permanent improvements. The landowner is thus enabled to control every act of the farmer's life—and he takes care to exercise his power.

The work for the reformer to accomplish, then, is this: The owner of idle land must be forced either to sell it, to cultivate it himself, or to pay heavily to the State every year for the privilege of keeping it idle; fixity of tenure must be secured to the farmer; the accumulation of burdens on the farmer's back must be prevented.

Every item of this programme is capable of being accomplished by a gradual confiscation of the land (or rather resumption of ownership of it by the nation) through the agency of an *ad valorem* land tax, increasing every year until at length the whole rents of the land come annually into the State coffers. While this process was gradually taking place rents could be assessed by public officials in order to prevent the landowner from following his customary practice of passing on the burden to the tenant.

If an act were passed imposing a tax of 2 per cent. on the annual value of all land, increasing by 2 per cent. every year, and if the operation of this act were postponed for thirty years from its passing, present values would not unduly depreciate, and yet in eighty years the full rents of all the land in the kingdom would be coming to the State, making her virtually owner. The resulting benefits would be enormous. In the first place, no man would be in a position to keep land idle without paying very heavily for it every year; the owner would in fact be changed into an occupier at a rent fixed by the State. Such rent would vary with the value of the land, and if the land were situated in a town or amidst tilled plots, the rent would rise in proportion to the rise in value of the surrounding land. In the town, the nominal owner would be forced to build in order to pay this heavy ground rent, or else to abandon

the site to another; in the country he would be forced in the same way to abandon or to cultivate. Nor in this case could he sublet to a farmer, since the latter would pay to the State the rent fixed by the State, and no more to any one; if the nominal owner wished to cultivate he would be obliged to become his own farmer, and the useless army of middlemen would be swept away.

With regard to the case of the overburdened land, it is easy to see that the results of the act in gradually diminishing and finally extinguishing the owner's rent, could be, by a clause to such effect, compulsorily accompanied by a proportional diminution and final extinction of tithes, other rent charges, and similar burdens. Thus, after the expiration of eighty years, this land would be as entirely free from such encumbrances as other land, and similarly would be forced into cultivation.

Let us now see how this would affect agriculture. The principal immediate causes of depression to-day in those neighbourhoods where land is available are: insecurity of tenure, and the small net return from the soil on account of heavy outgoings. The new system would render probably all land available, would secure fixity of tenure, would lessen the outgoings. This last statement may be proved very simply: the immense revenue coming to the State from the land would make it possible to abolish indirect taxation, save where necessary for the discouragement of more or less harmful industries; the increase in the total of land available for cultivation would reduce the land tax (or State rent) below the level of the old private rent; these two savings alone would suffice to make agriculture "pay."

It is the opening up of this new source of revenue which justifies the statement at the commencement of this article that a decrease in taxation would accompany an increase in the public revenue. The great demand for labour on the land would put an end to lack of employment, and bring about a reduction in the present burdensome poor rate. The creation of a prosperous agricultural class, with large purchasing power, would stimulate every branch of industry.

A word remains to be said to justify the confiscation of the land by the State. To the high Tory, to the man of ancient lineage, justification is at present impossible. It should be otherwise in the case of the reasonable man.

Let us begin by observing that what is advocated in this article —State proprietorship of the land—already exists in theory, no owner having strictly any higher interest than that of a tenant holding mediately or immediately of the king. And in the olden times the consideration he gave for that interest, though inadequate as a full payment, was certainly useful. For example, the military

forces of the kingdom were provided by the tenants. Such services in the course of years were discontinued—how this came about has already been demonstrated—but the fact remains that the ancestors, of the present holders of the land, or of their predecessors in title made some return for the rights granted to them. And the community 800 years ago regarded this as a very proper arrangement. Why, then, should not the men and women of to-day approve it? Because, says our Tory friend, long possession has created for the possessor a title it would be unjust to cancel.

It is quite true that it would be hard suddenly to deprive a man of what he had deemed to be his own; and any land nationalisation act should be postponed from coming into force for a considerable time after the date of its passing as a recognition of that hardship. But there is no reason for extending this concession to a man's heirs. The present landless men are the descendants of those on whose shoulders, in the Middle Ages, were cast the burdens which a former age had deemed it right for the landed class to bear. The iniquity has lasted too long, and if—not in the name of justice, but in the the name of grace—to-day's possessor is allowed to retain for some years a usurped position, the privilege must go no further by reason of mere accidents of birth. Heirs will have opportunity to seek a more honourable means of livelihood than squeezing the poor tenants on their fathers' estates. They may grumble, but in a matter so vitally important to the nation, reform cannot pause for a grumble. Long possession on the strength of an unrighteous title has been often recognised as making that title sound, on the ground of expediency. But that principle must yield before considerations of greater expediency; and it is certainly more expedient to obtain a cheap reform of our land laws than to uphold a discredited system whose continuance threatens so many disasters. In individual cases, land nationalisation might cause hardships, but on the whole the postponement of the coming into force of the act, and its very gradual operation, would secure to the man who happened to be a landowner at the time of its passing, the full benefit of his estates while he lived.

In the present circumstances of English party politics, the activities of an extreme Socialist group can bring about no good result, and may be mischievous. But if the Socialists are ready to abandon for a moment the vain prosecution of their more general desires, and concentrate their energies on an attempt to secure nationalisation of the land, they will invite to their fighting line for that purpose many thinkers and workers of the Liberal party, who are not prepared to go the whole way with them. Nor should the Socialists themselves scorn to follow such a course, since land nationalisation is no unimportant instalment of their own programme—if, indeed,

it be not rather true that (this reform once secured) such results would follow in the matter of a more equitable distribution of wealth, that industrial Socialism—at its best somewhat opposed to the instincts of the natural man—would cease to be demanded even by those who now preach it as the only remedy for the evils which arise from caste and monopoly in capital.

HAROLD WRIGHT.

WHAT SHOULD BE THE ATTITUDE OF REFORMERS TOWARDS AGRICULTURE?

SOCIALISTS wish to socialise the wealth of the country according to the well-worn formula, and yet neglect to begin at that industry which is universally agreed to be the one which is the foundation of all others, namely agriculture. We see myriads around us starving for want of food, we also see the possibilities of unlimited food in the land at our very doors, and while we have proved in many ways the advantages of municipal effort we neglect to use the one means here ready to our hands to free the people. The situation is strange, and almost worthy of a comic opera if it were not so sad. The people want food, and food there is in plenty in the soil around them, and yet we social reformers offer to them—municipal libraries, municipal trams, municipal baths, a municipal cemetery, and municipal gas *ad lib.* Isn't it about time to stop such foolery? Can we nourish starving childhood on a cookery book, or clothe our ragged sisters with a tramway rail? Is a municipal cemetery a sufficient answer to the cry of the workless man, or municipal soap and water enough to give to the dweller in overcrowded tenements?

The overburdened ratepayer wants relief here and now, and we offer only to increase his burdens. The great masses of the people are dreadfully poor. There is a vast and untold wealth lying idle and wasted in every part of our beautiful countryside, and yet many of our superior reformers waste their time and energy in trying to devise new forms of taxation. Is it not better to let the people produce their own wealth and secure it to their use by municipal effort, than to merely seek to re-adjust taxation and leave natural wealth untouched. Let the watchword be "Produce more and not concentrate effort in taxing wealth already produced." Town dwellers are living often at the rate of over 1000 to the acre, there are leagues of land urgently needing people in England, and yet many eminent reformers advocate emigration. Isn't it time we discovered England? The people of the towns are suffering from consumption, and are crying aloud for fresh air, there are miles and leagues of fresh, pure, clean countryside in England awaiting the people, and we dole out a few miserable acres of public parks at a wickedly extravagant price, and tell the people we are mighty wise in

providing them with such "lungs" and "open spaces." We prate eloquently of the glories of collectivism and of the Socialistic Utopia, and then offer to the people access to their native land in the form of a penal colony, or else a life of slavery on a dirty plot the size of a cabbage leaf. On the one hand, the wealth of agricultural England remains untouched; on the other municipal management pays handsomely, and still the people starve. Social reformers want a lead on the agricultural problem; the lead is—socialise farming. We are trying to reform society by beginning at the wrong end. Why should the greatest industry of all be left outside the ennobling and uplifting influence of collectivism. Or have we become so divinely civilised or cultured that we have forgotten our possession of a stomach, and can afford to leave the provision of agricultural wealth to serfs, felons, and fools in our own and in other lands. Is it nobler to run a municipal gas-works or a municipal farm; and, is there more æsthetic pleasure in the managing of a municipal sewer or a municipal fruit garden? Why should the collective ownership of a tramway be better than the collective ownership of the source of food and clothing?

If it is found necessary to protect the people's roads, water, and trams from the ravages of a crowd of bloodthirsty brigands in frock-coats, how much more necessary is it to protect their source of all food and clothing from the same unholy scoundrels who devour all and spare none? Is not the farmer more worthy of honour than any other craftsman? and why should his profession be ignored by reformers? The agricultural problem to-day, as ever, remains the "unknown problem." Nobody studies agricultural sociology, and while the people are rotting by the roadside, superior and eminent sociologists prefer to investigate into the scientific minimum it is possible for *other people* to live upon—*vide* Booth and Rowntree's *Studies in Poverty*. It is impossible to conceive of a Socialist State based upon an individualistic agriculture. Neither could a State have a permanent existence whose economic basis consisted of collectivist industrialism and a non-existent agriculture, if it were possible to imagine such a condition.

I will not labour the point that without Socialistic farming Socialism is impossible. It is enough to say that the whole argument lies in the fact that while certain phases of the production of agricultural wealth can be carried on for *use only* extremely easily, the art of production for profit or exchange is very difficult, and involves a vast amount of skill, training, and organisation; and in that fact lies the strength and the weakness of the small holdings theory. How great is this skill, training, and organisation will be seen by noting the failure of private enterprise to feed and clothe the people. It needs but a thought to be given to the political and economic conditions of to-day to see that in nothing has private

enterprise failed so greatly as in agriculture, not only in our own, but in other lands also. On the other hand, national or municipal farming is the key to the whole social problem. Start collectivist farms (whether State or municipal matters not), and you so far nationalise the land and get rid of the evils of landlordism. Socialise farming and you will create a demand for skilled agricultural labour at a living wage and under fair conditions, which can be supplied from your training colonies, and which will react upon the whole labour market even to the highest.

Municipal farms must create municipal workshops and factories to deal with the produce of the farms, and to regularise the employment of the people. They will also turn into productive channels the vast amount of manurial matter now wasted in destructors and turned out to sea. How great that amount is may be seen from the fact that London's road sweepings and house refuse alone, without sewage, would fertilise easily an area about twice its own size. By municipal farming the congestion of the towns would be automatically relieved, and the physical, mental, and moral health of the people be vastly improved as a result. Municipal farming will rouse less opposition than any other reform, because it is sane, rational, and appeals to the good sense of everybody. Collectivist farming is, above all things, reproductive expenditure, and bears directly upon the well-being of the whole people. It will create a great boom in every other trade and industry. National farming is of national value, and will give security from foreign invasion, and relieve the burden of the taxpayer. Municipal farming will abolish the waste of land, labour, and materials which are so great a feature of modern farming. It will get rid of the dirty and unhealthy conditions which now exist in the production of most forms of agricultural wealth. It will rouse the country peasantry from their lethargy, and create in them a new standard of life, and introduce to them new ideals of citizenship. It will also encourage agricultural skill and enterprise, and awaken a healthy spirit of emulation, improvement and progress through the whole countryside. Municipal farming will, by touching the foundation of life, cause a complete revolution in the cost of maintenance of all workhouses, prisons, asylums, as well as the Army and Navy, and cause them to become a *source of revenue* to the State, instead of a great drain upon its resources.

In a word, collectivist farming, by influencing the people at the very roots and foundat[illegible] of their lives, and by its uplifting influence, will of neces[illegible] also stimulate science, art, music, and all the other joys and grac[illegible] life for the nation as a whole.

Now is this thing practical? Can municipal farming be made to pay as well as other municipal efforts, or is it something apart from all such enterprises? State farming for profit has been recom-

mended by a Committee of the Board of Agriculture under the late Tory Government. I unhesitatingly assert that, in spite of the present condition of agriculture, municipal, collectivist, or State farming can be made to pay, and to pay handsomely. The Crown and Ecclesiastical Commissioners already own and manage about 350,000 acres of farm land, and possess a staff of trained farmers who could well undertake to supply a large part of the needs of the Army and Navy in agricultural produce.

Agriculture is, beyond all question, the one industry which would pay better than any other for the introduction of collectivist methods on a sound business basis. Municipal or State farming must be treated as a business and not as a fad. A municipal farm, as I mean it, is not a penal establishment, a reformatory, a training school, or a convalescent home: in certain of its aspects it may be distantly allied to these things, but in reality it is vastly different. It must be equipped with the best machinery, the most highly skilled labour, the best buildings, and the most scientific skill that money can buy. It must be prepared to meet and to vanquish in the open market all home or foreign produced goods, and show that intelligence, organisation, and a living wage are able to triumph over sweated labour, and to beat it in cheapness of production.

In all farm colony schemes the aim must be to make institutions of them, wherein the labourers are treated partially or wholly as patients, and wherein the labourer is the chief item, and the crops and their cost of production a secondary consideration. In municipal or collectivist farming the production of large crops at a low cost is the great thing, and the labourers must be treated in exactly the same way as in all other industries, viz., as men having considerable education, self-reliance, and skill, and worthy of a wage which will bring to them the joys of manhood, to their women folks health and contentment, and to their children the happy innocent carelessness which is childhood's divine prerogative.

I will not enter here into technical details as to the way municipal or State farms could be profitably managed in relation to crops, rotations, utilisation of sewage and house refuse, buildings, and such matters, though I am willing to give such particulars when desired. I will now proceed to give the results of a few personal experiments in the organisation of farm work and in agricultural finance.

I have proved that a higher standard of intelligence is obtainable amongst labourers if they are able to work in parties instead of alone. I have proved that where there is constant work, a decent house, and a living wage can be paid, and also where reasonable amusements are provided for winter evenings, neither men nor lads show a desire to leave the land. My experience leads me to think that if all forms of "truck" were abolished, and farm labourers

were treated much on the same lines as town mechanics, much good would result. I have been taught in a very hard school indeed that specialism is necessary to cheapness of production, and that great variety is expensive. I have found that office work is a bore, and should be reduced to a minimum, and most of it done by others than the farm people. Men who are HAPPY will do the best work and the most of it. This simple fact has been brought home to me during many a long hard day's toil. With increased sanitary knowledge there is an increased number of rules and regulations as to the management of those farms which produce certain kinds of food stuffs. Every such sanitary improvement means an increase in the capital necessary to work the farm, but in the end it always tends to a greater efficiency, and ultimately to a reduction in the cost of production. This alone is no small argument in favour of a well-equipped, properly capitalised system of collectivist management.

There is nothing more misleading in agricultural sociology than the false generalisations that are so frequently and wantonly made. Men talk of particular instances of profits or losses and vainly imagine that their own experience is capable of being universally applied. I cannot insist too strongly that beyond all things agriculture is luck, chance, or a gamble more than anything else, unless well organised and on a large scale, and then it is a certainty. The same conditions which make for success or failure, such as weather, manure, markets, the personal factor, and a hundred other things, most likely never even approximately occur again. In no branch of agricultural sociology are there so many of these false generalisations as in the matter of small holdings, *e.g.*, certain writers advocate corn growing on such holdings. Now is it possible to imagine certain circumstances in which wheat could be grown at a profit at 20s. per qr. on small holdings, but it is obvious in such an extreme case that generalising is misleading and dangerous. I could easily give facts and figures about my own farming business, but why do so? Such facts and figures by themselves are of no value unless multiplied a thousandfold. The financial reasons for municipal farming are most powerful. There are three points about agricultural finance which should be especially noted: (1) The capital involved in up-to-date farming on a large scale is so great that many persons prefer to invest it otherwise, so as to live without the worry and risk of farming; (2) the turnover of all purely agricultural concerns is very slow, about once a year being the rule; (3) agricultural profit and loss accounts are very difficult to draw up with any degree of accuracy.

Agricultural finance is difficult because of its risks, as, while a well-managed holding may be reckoned to yield a fair profit over a number of years, it may, owing to a difficult season, show a loss in one year equal to the accumulated profits of two or three previous

years. This is a serious matter for the small holder, but for a large farmer or a municipality it is not so harmful. Agricultural book-keeping is difficult because of the stock-taking. Everything is in a state of flux. Your crops that are partly grown may turn out to be good or poor and of great or of little value. Your manure in the land may be of much or little value according to the season, while your animals may vary £2 a head in one week. There is probably no other industry in which so great a variety of goods vary so much in value. These things make for instability and lack of enterprise in any form of individualistic agriculture, but would be largely corrected by the influence of an organised municipalism.

Agriculture and the Unemployed Problem.

When we come to study the problem of the unemployed we see evidences of the same neglect of agricultural sociology which is the hall-mark of most of our modern reformers. Writers on this great problem, as usual, miss the point of the whole business by calmly ignoring the greatest factor. Now as always agriculture is despised and rejected of men, and these good, kind, clever celebrities talk in their pettifogging way about the regulation of industry, and the provision of their miserable farm colonies for their unemployed without a thought about the one industry which is the foundation of all others, and which is the cause of all other irregularities of employment.

It cannot be reiterated too often that agriculture is a seasonable employment of the first magnitude, and that the general problem of unemployment can only be solved by beginning at the agricultural side of the problem. One of the greatest difficulties of our agricultural life consists of the trouble to regulate the labour. Farms are for large parts of the year being worked overtime, and at other times are very slack, consequently the quality of the work suffers greatly, and much work is left undone altogether, and much is done at wrong seasons. The work has to be regulated according to the number of labourers available at the busiest season, and much dependence has to be placed on casual labour of a very poor kind. This on most farms is a very great evil, both to the farms, their managers, and the labourers. It is an evil that must exist in any system of individualistic farming, and can only be adequately dealt with by properly organised collectivist management. This system of excessive rush, alternating with almost idleness, which is unavoidable on most farms and is especially noticeable on fruit and market garden farms, is very bad both for the farm foreman and for the regularly employed labourers. By dealing directly with the

problem of the organisation of agricultural labour a great deal more will be done to get at the heart of the unemployed problem than in any other way. It being impossible from natural causes to regularise purely agricultural employment, it must then be taken as the standard by which all other industries must be regulated. By municipal farming this supreme difficulty could easily be overcome in a rational and businesslike manner, much to the advantage of agriculture and of industry generally.

Municipal, State, or collectivist farming would solve the Labour difficulty by having in connection with it, and yet as a separate industry, various forms of municipal workshops and factories in which during the winter and the slack seasons men could, under the best possible conditions, earn a living as craftsmen at another trade. A properly-managed municipal farm would always be able to draw from these factories or workshops enough labour to enable the crops to be secured under the best conditions, both of labour and of crop quality, and the eight-hours day even in harvest time become possible; while crop specialising could be carried out in a way quite unknown to private enterprise. Under collectivist management agriculture would be no longer a worse paid employment than other industries and it would not be in any sense *infra dig* for the factory worker, or even the journalist, to be trained to do certain kinds of agricultural work and come outside for a month or so to help to secure the golden corn and luscious fruit, which is to feed himself and his fellows during the dark days of the coming winter.

Before leaving this matter I wish to refer briefly to the subject of the nation's food in time of war. Of all the mad proposals ever discussed by a Royal Commission the one just published is surely the maddest. This extraordinary proposal of a number of disordered brains is to establish large national fortified granaries in England. In our own land of all places! The most fertile land in the world, the soil is idle all around us and we are too lazy and too stupid to let our people work out their own economic salvation on their native soil, and yet we propose to build granaries for foreign corn. Language fails even a master of invective at the bare thought of such a proposal. Where can our corn supply be stored so well as in those natural ornaments of the land, the well-filled stackyards of our own beautiful English countryside and what can protect them so well as the stout hearts and sturdy limbs of free-born British farmers.

Now what are the practical steps to take? The need is great, the people are perishing, and we must haste to save them. Are we to go on for years as we are, acting like Vivisectionists, calmly and indifferently studying the agonies of a people who are living in a perfect hell?

How long is this damnable farce of starvation in the midst of plenty to go on? Isn't it time we called a halt? The soil of England could in two years feed these starving peoples and bring to them the great joy of a glorious economic salvation and drive the present loveless poverty and misery away as the mist of the morning at the coming forth of the sun of England's bounty.

I make once more the following suggestions:

The army and navy should, as far as possible, be fed and clothed from home-produced materials grown on national farms and manufactured in national or municipal workshops and factories.

If it makes for the safety of the nation to build warships and guns, &c., in national dockyards and arsenals, how much more necessary is it for the nation to own and manage the means of clothing and feeding the men without whom the guns and warships are useless.

The nation should also grow all the horses it needs for warfare and so save all possibility of further remount scandals. The land is ready for such use. The War Office owns large tracts which are eminently suitable. The Board of Agriculture should be re-organised and then be entrusted with the duty of directly managing these national farms for the benefit of the army, navy, and allied services. It should also have the task of overseeing and assisting all other national and municipal farming enterprises, and instead of being the useless incumbrance it now is, should be made the chief revenue-producing department of the State. Failing which somebody who is in charge should be shot.

Much might be written on this subject of the re-organisation of the Board of Agriculture, but time forbids. Every local authority should be urged, wherever possible, to take up land for the purpose of commercially producing crops to supply the needs of its own and neighbouring poor law requirements instead of offering these things to public contract, and as far as possible municipal workshops on a paying basis should replace the workhouses. Municipal farms should provide all the road metal needed for the main and by-roads and so effect a mighty saving to the rates. In many cases 30 per cent. to 50 per cent. of the cost of the roads could be saved by direct ownership and working of the road metal quarries. There should also be a complete system of intercommunication and trading between the various public bodies for the satisfying of their mutual needs.

My time has gone, and I am not able to develop a subject in one paper about which a library needs writing. Suffice it to say, that by commencing at agriculture Social reform can be brought about in a natural, rational, and businesslike manner, with a

minimum of legislative activity and a maximum of direct personal benefit to the community.

In conclusion, while admitting all the advantages of town life, I submit that humanity cannot consider with equanimity the prospect of living without the sweet smell of the fresh turned earth and the new mown hay and all that they imply. Neither culture, science, art, nor any other attribute of town civilisation are a fit exchange for the deep enjoyments given to us by the nightingale, the primrose, and the other simple pleasures of country life, or for the sturdy health to be got by a spell of hard toil in the open fields. The economic ideal I plead for is an ideal founded upon a sound business basis, and one which also comprises the greatest possibilities of a high ideal manhood. It is twofold. Towards you poor and imprisoned town-dwellers it offers a knowledge of that true inner meaning of the glory and majesty of nature which is but dimly revealed even to the most cultured of those who know Nature only when in holiday mood. It offers to you townsmen a deeper understanding of that mystic force which is unknown to those who have never met stern, hard Mother Nature in life and death grasp. Towards the countrymen it offers all the benefits of culture and comradeship, which are the greatest boons of town life, and will lift them for ever far above the degradation of their peasant serfdom. It is an ideal capable of easy attainment and of universal application. It offers food to the hungry, clothes to the naked, homes to the homeless, wisdom to the fool, joy to the sad, and the infinite treasures of science, art, poetry and religion to every human dweller on the earth, and as such I beg of it your careful and thoughtful attention.

RICHARD HIGGS.

PROGRESSIVE AND UNPROGRESSIVE NATIONS.

> "The best state for human nature is that in which, while no one is poor, no one desires to be richer, nor has any reason to fear being thrust back by the efforts of others to push themselves forward."—J. S. MILL.

THE changes which have taken place in England during the past century and a half have completely transformed the face of the country, and the habits, manners and ideals of the people. Till the middle of the eighteenth century, life went on much as it had for the preceding five hundred years. The bulk of the population was engaged in agriculture, and was thus pretty evenly distributed over the land. The great centres of population were the principal seaports, but even these, London alone excepted, presented no such congested masses of people as are found in our modern commercial and manufacturing cities. Industrial pursuits, other than agriculture, were carried on for the most part in the home, or in small workshops, for the factory system had not yet established itself; and internal trade was restricted in amount, every district being practically self-supporting. Means of communication were limited and even the main roads were often in an almost impassable condition. This affected only a small minority of the population, however, for most people had little occasion to travel, and passed their lives in or near their native places. Life was much less strenuous in every way than our own, and wealth more evenly distributed. Great fortunes were seldom amassed except by a few foreign merchants, and there was not the abject and hopeless poverty that afflicts large masses in the England of to-day. Lastly it may be noted that the fields were still green, and the skies unclouded with smoke, while the streams ran clear and bright even through the towns.

About the middle of the eighteenth century great changes were inaugurated. Capitalists commenced to exploit the labour of the artisans, and the foundation of the factory system was laid. With the introduction and constant improvement of machinery, the necessity for special buildings and abundant capital arose; the independent workman was thus in great measure displaced, and a system of wage labour developed. The application of steam to

industrial purposes greatly accelerated the changes that were taking place; huge factories were erected, and country villages soon grew into great towns, drawing to themselves more and more of the rural population. The necessity of feeding these town dwellers gave a great stimulus to internal trade, and led to improved means of communication; first, better roads, then canals, in course of time railways, tramways, post-offices in every town and village, telegraphs, telephones, and the many other conveniences of our present complicated civilisation. Machinery was also applied to the cultivation of the land, lessening the need for hand labour, and driving more of the country people into the towns, which soon exceeded in aggregate population the rest of the country. The importation of food and the raw materials of manufacture, and the exportation of ever-increasing quantities of manufactured goods, greatly increased our foreign commerce, and stimulated shipbuilding.

The changes thus brought about have not been an unmixed benefit. The mass of national wealth has enormously increased, but its distribution is so unequal that a large proportion of the population live constantly on the verge of destitution. The fierceness of the competition to get some share of this wealth has intensified the struggle for existence, and so has caused undue attention to be given to the procuring of the means of living, to the detriment of higher interests. It has, moreover, reacted in many ways upon the health of the people. The deleterious atmosphere of manufacturing towns, the overcrowding of their inhabitants, the employment of women and children in factories, the unhealthy or dangerous character of many occupations, and the general artificiality of town life, have led to a serious deterioration in the physical condition of the artisan population. Among all classes, an alarming increase is observed in mental and nervous disorders, and in many other diseases incident to our hurried and anxious mode of life. Manners, too, have suffered, and class antipathy has become greatly emphasised. The æsthetic faculties have been dulled, and the joy of life diminished, by the ruthless destruction of natural beauty; for wherever manufacturing has spread, the sky has been polluted by smoke, the streams have been defiled, and the vegetation more or less destroyed. These are some of the incidents of what is called progress.

With all the increase of mechanical industries, employment could not be found for the growing population, many thousands of whom were driven to emigrate to distant lands every year; others, led by a desire for gain or a spirit of adventure, have also been attracted to new countries, so that there is hardly a spot on earth where Britons (and other Europeans, for most continental nations have followed the lead of England in these matters in a greater

or less degree) have not established themselves. This has led to a wider intercourse between the various races than has ever taken place before in the world's history, and has brought the progressive civilisation of Europe into conflict with the stationary forms which prevail among Eastern nations and other unprogressive races.

Wherever the European has gone he has attempted to introduce his ideals and mode of life, under the assumption that he is an essentially superior person, and his way of living the most desirable. The evolution which his own people have gone through he regards as necessary to all true progress; the nations who refuse to accept his view of things are set down as backward and unprogressive, and he has conceived the idea that it is his mission to bring them up-to-date.

The advantages of what is called "civilisation" seem so patent to the average European that it becomes an act of charity to share them with uncivilised nations; and the inducement is still greater when the charitable act proves highly profitable to the doer of it. But, strange to say, the intended recipients of this charity are sometimes unresponsive, or resist vigorously the blessings offered to them. Our troubles with China have been chiefly because that nation prefers her own form of civilisation to that which we would force upon her.

"The Chinaman is filled with contempt for the vain agitation and restless activity of the Europeans, of whom he knows only the more active and the more adventurous. He does not undervalue the profits of commerce, but he thinks with Confucius that life is not worth living if it has any other aim than the realisation of the beautiful and the true.

"The European, on his part (the missionary excepted), has never cared to show himself other than a merchant greedy for gain; he has been too much inclined to subordinate his moral ideas to the needs of his economic life; preoccupied with business and gain, he has forgotten that true civilisation is not measured by scientific progress and perfection of machinery, but by social progress and moral perfection."[1]

"What the foreigner realises only dimly and by slow degrees is that the Chinaman has not the slightest desire to be reformed by him; that he disputes *in toto* that reform is reform; and that no demonstration in the world will convince him of a flaw in his own theory of national perfection. He points to a Government infinitely more stable than that of any European state; to order observed, and justice effectively, if roughly, administered. . . .; he claims a civilisation that was already at a high pitch when Britons were wandering painted in the woods; he boasts of a code of ethics equal in wisdom and amplitude to our own; he observes a religion which, while it touches the extremes of purity in doctrine and of degradation in practice, is yet accommodated to every situation in life, and enables him, subject only to the test of dutiful observance, to pass with confidence into a future world. And he turns round to us and, with a pardonable self-confidence, asks what we have to give him compared with these."[2]

---

[1] "China and the European Powers." By René Pinon. (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, August 1, 1904.)

[2] *Times* (Weekly Edition), January 27, 1893.

If he could see the conditions under which vast numbers of the inhabitants of European States live, his doubts would be emphasised and confirmed. Could he possibly look forward with satisfaction to seeing the happy condition of the Chinese peasantry, described in the following passage, displaced by a Chinese "Black Country," or a reproduction of such dreary places as Runcorn or St. Helen's, or even of an ordinary British manufacturing town, with its smoke, dirt, overcrowding, and rowdyism? Who would not wish to see our own working population as happy and contented as these "heathen Chinese"? The Englishman, who quotes the following description by a Chinaman of the life of his people, vouches for its truthfulness.

"Far away in the East, under such sunshine as you never saw (for even such light as you have you stain and infect with sooty smoke), on the shore of a broad river stands the house where I was born. It is one among thousands; but everyone stands in its own garden, simply painted in white or grey, modest, cheerful and clean. For many miles along the valley, one after the other, they lift their blue or red-tiled roofs out of a sea of green, while here or there glitters out over a clump of trees the gold enamel of some tall pagoda. The river, crossed by frequent bridges and crowded with barges and junks, bears on its clear stream the traffic of thriving village markets. For prosperous peasants people all the district, owning and tilling the fields their fathers owned and tilled before them. The soil on which they work, they may say, they and their ancestors have made. For see, almost to the summit, what once were barren hills are waving green with cotton, and rice, sugar, oranges and tea. Water drawn from the river-bed girdles the slopes with silver, and falling from channel to channel in a thousand bright cascades, plashing in cisterns, chuckling in pipes, soaking and oozing in the soil, distributes freely to all alike fertility, verdure and life. . . . Healthy toil, sufficient leisure, frank hospitality, a content born of habit and undisturbed by commercial ambitions, a sense of beauty fostered by the loveliest nature in the world, and finding expression in gracious and dignified manners where it is not embodied in exquisite works of art—such are the characteristics of the people among whom I was born. . . . What have you to offer in its place, you our would-be civilisers?"[1]

We may set beside this a picture, by Sir George Birdwood, of Indian peasant life.

"For leagues and leagues round the old Maratha cities of Poona and Sattara stretch fields of corn and pulse and oil grains and deep dyeing flowers, the livelier verdure of the rice fields following the courses of the irriguous *nullahs* like a green thread wrought in gold; and rich orchards, and high groves of mango mark the sites of the villages hidden in their shade. Glad with the dawn the men come forth to their work, and glad in their work they stand all through the noontide, singing at the well or shouting as they reap and plough; and when the stillness and the dew of evening fall upon the land like the blessing and the peace of God, the merry-hearted men gather with their cattle, in long winding lines, to their villages again. Slowly over all the wide champaign, the black lines

[1] "The White Peril." By George Lynch. (*Nineteenth Century*, June 1905.)

shrink and disappear into the lengthening shadows of the mango trees, and the day is closed in night. Thus day follows day, and the year is crowned with gladness. It is in the contemplation of such scenes as these that the Englishman in India drinks deep of the bliss of knowing others blest." [1]

No wonder he expresses the hope that some day "Europe will learn to taste of some of the measureless content and happiness in life which is still to be found in the pagan East, even as it was once found in pagan Greece and Rome." [2]

Even the Egyptian fellah has a happier life than the bulk of our own working population. Writing in the *Leisure Hour* for July 1905, Mr. Harold Spender says: "As you watch the people at their work and listen to their songs and laughter, note their clean clothes and bright faces, their merry children and happy, child-hearted women, you gain an impression of happiness which, alas, you no longer find on the countryside of old England."

How is it that this content and happiness no longer come to us? Because we are pursuing unworthy aims and grasping after elusive pleasures, instead of finding delight in our daily occupations and in the incidents of a simple life. What is this thing that we call "progress"? If it means progress in wisdom and virtue, in culture and kindliness, in art, literature and music, we cannot have too much of it; but it does not seem very evident that we are advancing in these directions. What most persons mean by progress and civilisation is increase of wealth and material comfort, improved (or, at any rate quickened and cheapened) methods of manufacture, greater facilities for travelling and intercourse in every way with the outside world, expansion of commerce, and extension of political liberty. All these matters relate to the outward life, and advancement in regard to them does not necessarily mean a real uplifting of the race. On the contrary, a heedless pursuit of material advantage is attended with grave moral dangers, and does not tend to the greatest good of the greatest number, even in material things.

Mr. Froude spoke some weighty words on this subject in his inaugural address at Oxford (October 26, 1892):

"Indisputably there is progress of a kind," he said, "but I am obliged to ask, whither? Progress from what to what? Is it so certain that in things most essential we are so much wiser than those who went before us? Once more the question rises: What is the meaning of human life? Is it that we may multiply our enjoyments and conveniences, and pursue more sharply and successfully what we call our interests? Is it that we are to make ourselves masters of the elements, search into the mysteries of nature, and use our discoveries to make existence more enjoyable? Or is all this only secondary—and is it our real business here to make ourselves brave, true, just and honourable men?"

[1] *The Industrial Arts of India*, vol. ii. pp. 152 and 153.
[2] *Ibid.*, vol. i. p. 137.

It never occurs to the average practical man that his ideal is a low one, and that some of those nations he is so anxious to civilise may, after all, have chosen the better part, and have no need of his improvements. To revert to the Chinese once more: What advantage would it be to these people to displace their intensive system of agriculture by large farms, steam ploughs, and casual labourers? or to introduce middlemen to intercept produce at every point from the farm to the table? The mass of the people are far better off under the present system than they would be under a more "progressive" one. The Chinese, as Sir Robert Hart tells us,

"are essentially a self-supporting nation, and it is this fact, not official restrictions, which accounts for the slow growth of trade. The Chinese have the best food, the best drink, and the best clothing in the world; they have a wonderful system of internal trade, and they want nothing from abroad." [1]

It seems almost an absurd thing to be trying to force our artificial civilisation upon unwilling nations when their populations are, for the most part, better off than our own in the essentials of happy and healthy life.

"If we set aside such general calamities as plagues and famines, there is more real poverty, more starvation, more utter misery in England and America to-day than exists in any Buddhist land, where the people are poorer indeed in this world's goods, but richer, incomparably richer, in that trained attitude of mind, born of a deep appreciation of the realities of existence and of a cultured æstheticism, which alone can give rise to true contentment, to mental peace, to a happiness which finds its goal rather in the inalienable delights of the exercise of the higher mental faculties, than in the possession of innumerable means of advancing wealth and commerce, of gratifying sense and avarice, of promoting merely bodily comforts." [2]

Even the despised negro does not admit the essential superiority of the white man. Professor Du Bois, a coloured professor in Atalanta University, Georgia, "is profoundly convinced of the high capacities of his race, which seems to be especially gifted for the apt expression of strong and passionate feeling, in oratory, in literature, and in music." But, like the Latin and Celtic races, they "can never put forth their full powers under the influence of purely material aims." [3]

Another negro writer, Mr. D. E. Tobias, contributed two articles to *La Revue*, in August 1904, in defence and laudation of his people. Far from being a degraded class, living under a curse as the

[1] *North American Review*, January 1901.
[2] Editor of *Buddhism* (quoted in *Review of Reviews*, December 1908).
[3] "De Profundis; The Race Problem in America." By Maurice Sheldon Amos. (*Contemporary Review*, November 1903.)

"servant of servants" to superior races, he maintains that by nature *they* are the superior race.

"If," he says, "the white races of Europe had only been taught from their infancy that the coloured races form a larger portion of the human family than do the whites, and that, so far from being inferior, they are in reality very superior, especially in their ideas of religion and philosophy, as well as moral excellence, there never would have been any race question in the United States to-day."

It is astonishing to find ourselves compared unfavourably with the negro race, but the latter has qualities in which the more progressive white man is deficient. Mr. Stanley Little, writing on "Britain's Destiny" in *King and Country* for December 1902, says:

"Our very crassness of blood, our very coarseness, which exceeds the coarseness of many Africans—and certainly the Zulu is far more refined—is the very quality which, in an Imperial race, is most to be prized. The unblushing selfishness of the Englishman makes him able to take care of himself wherever he happens to stray. The Briton is neither subtle, nor æsthetic, nor intellectual, but he has an unerring instinct for the best things of the earth, and by pushing and elbowing he has taken to himself all the fairest portions of the world."

It may seem a piece of exaggeration to describe the Zulu as a better gentleman than the average Englishman, but, if we may accept the testimony of another writer, we have something to learn from the uncivilised Hottentot, usually regarded as one of the most degraded members of the human family. Writing in the *Gentleman's Magazine* (June 1903), Mr. C. Louis Leipoldt says:

"The prevalent idea that the Bushman is the lowest type of humanity, made a little superior to the gorilla and an ace lower than the chimpanzee, is one that cannot be maintained when once his folklore is examined. . . . A high ideal of moral development is characteristic of his race. . . . The Bushman taught his sons a moral code which was as irreproachable as that of the Persians of old, and one of the prime factors which had influenced the evolution of this code was respect for women. The boy was not to lie, not to steal, not to commit rape or to harm his fellows, but above all to show respect to his mother and sisters. The highest oath he could take was to swear in the name of his eldest sister, and the most unmanlike action he could be guilty of was to lay hands upon his father's daughter. So high was the moral code of the old Bushman that one searches in vain to find words in their language which will express immoral thought or describe immoral actions. One finds, on the contrary, that they possessed words which expressed a degree of moral purity which a European cannot very well put into words in his own language."

Prince Monolu Massaquoi, in an article which he recently contributed to the *Century Magazine* (April 1905), strikingly confirms this latter statement. He says, that in none of the eighteen dialects which he knows are there any words with which to curse

and swear. "When one hears a profane word it is always in English, German, or some other foreign language." He is referring, of course, to the unsophisticated native. The natives on the coast, demoralised by Europeans, form a striking contrast to the natives of the interior, as all observers declare.

The Government of the United States has been busy in recent years trying to "civilise" the Filipinos. If what Sir W. Gifford Palgrave wrote of these people thirty years ago was true, there was little need for the interference of their new masters in their domestic arrangements. He described their condition as almost ideal, and expressed a prophetic dread of the advent of the demon of progress, which has been sadly realised.

"A land and people," he wrote, "who both come nearer to what, in my idea, this world of ours and its inhabitants ought to be than perhaps any other that I am acquainted with. To climate, position, geological formation and the like circumstances, the land owes its excellence; the inhabitants theirs, more than anything else, I think, to a healthy conservatism, and a happy immunity from the virus inoculation of improvement and progress. Good in themselves and their surroundings, they have wisely kept aloof from the worst enemy of the Good and Well-being, the Better. Perhaps they, too, will, at no distant date, be drawn into the general vortex, and learn, with or from European or North-American teachers the desire to be better, or, in the accepted phrase, to 'better themselves,' with the inevitable result that they will be worse and worse off."[1]

He tells us that,

"In bodily formation and mental characteristics alike (they) may fairly claim a place not among the middling ones merely, but almost among the higher names inscribed on the world's national scale; and though not exactly a superior are eminently an estimable, pre-eminently an amiable race."[2]

"His family, as that of his Chinese or Japanese cousins . . . is a pleasing sight, much subordination and little constraint, unison in gradation, liberty not license. Orderly children, respected parents, women subject but not suppressed, men ruling but not despotic, reverence with kindness, obedience in affection, these form a lovable picture, nor by any means a rare one, in the villages of the Eastern Isles."[3]

At the time of his visit, there were no "cads" or "roughs" among the population. There are plenty now, as we shall see, among the civilisers of this earthly paradise.

The land was cultivated chiefly by small proprietors, and in their diligent hands produced abundant crops. The food of the people was chiefly rice; but famine was unknown, and even scarcity was a rare experience. "In the worst of years hardly a sack of grain has to be imported; in average seasons the

[1] Essay on "Malay Life in the Philippines," in *Ulysses; or, Scenes and Studies in Many Lands*, p. 138.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 141. [3] *Ibid.* p. 154.

land has enough for her children, all swarming as they are, and to spare."

"Not so much what they have, but rather what they have not, makes the good fortune of the Philippines; the absence of European enterprise, the absence of European capital. A few European capitalist settlers, a few giant estates, a few central factories, a few colossal money-making combinations of organised labour, and gainful produce, and all balance of property and production, or ownership and labour, that leaves to the poorest cottager enough, and yet to the total colony abundance to spare, would be disorganised, displaced, upset; to be succeeded by day labour, pauperism, government relief, subscriptions, starvation."[1]

He concludes his panegyric thus:

"Of all tropical lands, all tropical races, that it has been my lot to visit, none have left a pleasanter, a more heart-satisfying memory than the Philippine Archipelago, the home of the half-civilised Malay. Is wholly civilised Europe, is England herself, a better home to her children, a happier? Compare and judge."[2]

Now let us see what kind of "improvement" the "wholly civilised" Americans have introduced. They have imported the worst features of American life among the simple population—drink, profligacy, corruption, and general licence. So we learn from an article by Mr. John Foreman in the *Contemporary Review* for September 1904. He speaks of the low moral character of the agents, both military and civil, whom the Americans employed; of the debasing influences which followed in their wake, and their indifference to the maintenance of prestige.

"The deplorable fact that the Filippino has no respect for the individual American can only be understood by reviewing the events which followed the military occupation of Manila.

"American volunteer regiments marched into Manila in good order like regular troops; but as soon as the novelty of their strange environment wore off they gave themselves up to all sorts of excesses, debauchery and vice.

"Little by little, nearly four-fifths of the troops were sent back to the United States, and, happily, among them went the negro regiments, whose brutal conduct in the interior seriously jeopardised the hope of a peaceful solution."

But if some of the bad were sent home, plenty of others remained behind. The military transgressed themselves in one way, the civil officers in another.

"Americans like to do everything on a big scale, and the Filippino recognises now how trifling were the pilferings of the Spanish officials, compared with the enormous defalcations which we hear of weekly under the present rule.

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 161. [2] *Op. cit.*, p. 168.

"The late civil governor, in his Cincinnati speech, spoke of the humiliation it was to him to know that seventeen American treasurers in the islands were serving their twenty-five years' imprisonment."

Of the various reforms introduced, he says:

"Material changes have been effected in the islands since the American advent, many of which, however, have merely supplanted institutions or arrangements which were already sufficiently satisfactory; while some are merely a provision for the large influx of Americans, others are for the public good, and others constitute a public nuisance."

It is an unfortunate and deplorable fact that, with few exceptions, wherever the white races have been brought into contact with the coloured ones they have failed to win their confidence, and the latter have usually deteriorated by the intercourse. The debasement of the negro on the African littoral has been already referred to; his position in the United States is scarcely any better. The American Indians have been practically exterminated instead of civilised, and the natives of Australia and New Zealand are rapidly approaching the same fate. In our Indian possessions the population has greatly increased under British rule, but their material condition has not improved, and we have not gained their sympathy. The relations of China with European powers have always been of a doubtful character, periods of peaceful though sullen intercourse being broken now and again by anti-foreign movements and murderous outbreaks. Japan has paid Europe the compliment of copying her institutions, but her development has been voluntary, and not forced upon her by an alien people.

Many reasons may be assigned for these unsatisfactory relations between the white and the coloured races. Want of sympathy is responsible for a great deal. The white races, especially the Anglo-Saxon sections of them, are so convinced of their own superiority that they usually treat the coloured races as barbarians, or at best undeveloped members of the human family—this even in the case of the inhabitants of India and China, who are heirs of a civilisation older by many centuries than that of Europe, and who themselves are often more highly cultured than their critics. "The idea," as Professor Max Müller remarks, "that anything can come from the East equal to European thought, or even superior to it, never enters their minds"; so they treat the natives with contempt. Missionaries approach these people with the best of intentions, but usually with a fixed determination to eradicate all their heathen notions, and to win them to Western ideas of civilisation.

The deterioration which has overtaken most alien peoples when brought into contact with Europeans is not to be attributed to Missionary enterprise, however, though the veneer of Christianity and

civilisation that savage tribes acquire from them often makes the so-called Christians inferior as men to their unconverted brethren. The shocking depravity that marks many half-civilised native races, and the rapid decay which they undergo upon the advent of white men among them, are due to the brutal disregard of all sense of duty towards them shown by conquering armies, pioneer colonists, and greedy traders. Not content with stealing their land, they often enslave their bodies, and introduce among them destructive vices that quickly sap their race vitality. They may talk of "civilising" them, but their one aim is to make profit out of them for their own benefit. The treatment of the natives in the Congo Free State, and in our own Australian colonies, are only recent, and perhaps extreme, examples of what has taken place all over the world where the white man has set himself to exploit his coloured brother.

It is to be hoped that ere long the nations that call themselves civilised will awake to a sense of their duty to the less progressive peoples. That duty, in some instances, may be to let the latter alone; in others, to offer them in a brotherly way the good things that we believe would be for their benefit; in others again, to cease from our presumptuous vanity, and humbly submit to learn what *they* have to teach *us*—and that is often much. Let us, at any rate, recognise that all men are not of the same genius, and allow those who differ from us in race and temperament to develop their lives in their own way.[1]

If we could only bring ourselves to see things in a broad enough way, we should probably come to the conclusion that there is some reason and necessity for all these differences of race and habit. The various members of the human family might be found to is as essential to the welfare of the whole as the many parts and organs of the human body to the efficiency of the physical structure. If this be so, when we do harm to our dark-skinned brother we bring injury upon the whole race, ourselves included. And when we would do good to him, we must be sure that we understand his nature and capacities. To force European civilisation upon all the peoples of the world would be as foolish as to develop only the

[1] Mr. H. G. Wells has penned serious and prophetic words in regard to these race problems. In the chapter on "Race in Utopia," in his recently published work, *A Modern Utopia*, he says, referring to the influence of the Development theory in giving rise to false generalisations: "Extraordinary intensifications of racial definition are going on; the vileness, the inhumanity, the incompatibility of alien races is being steadily exaggerated. The natural tendency of every human being towards a stupid conceit in himself and his kind, a stupid depreciation of all unlikeness, is traded upon by this bastard science. . . . These new arbitrary and unsubstantial race prejudices become daily more formidable. They are shaping policies and modifying laws, and they will certainly be responsible for a large proportion of the wars, hardships, and cruelties the immediate future holds in store for our earth. No generalisations about race are too extravagant for the inflamed credulity of the present time. No attempt is ever made to distinguish differences in inherent quality—the true racial differences—from artificial differences due to culture" (p. 329).

muscular system in the human body; the other parts of the structure would quickly become atrophied. The ideals of material progress are not high, and where they have been most fully realised, and in proportion to their realisation, the higher and more spiritual qualities have shown defect.

It would be futile to attempt to determine the exact place and office of the many races of mankind in the "maximus homo" (to adopt an expression of Swedenborg's), or sum total of humanity; but the three great divisions of the world, regarded ethnographically, Europe, Asia, and Africa (America and Australasia are now but an extension of Europe), seem to correspond with the three great divisions of human faculties, the practical, the contemplative, and the emotional.[1] The European is essentially practical; he has an eye to the main chance, to the acquisition of wealth and power, and the means of indulging the bodily desires. The Asiatic is content with little, but loves to meditate and philosophise upon life. The African is by nature emotional; his virtues and his vices both arise from his emotional temperament. Now, it is extremely desirable that what is good in all these faculties should be preserved to the race; therefore, neither class should seek to predominate to the prejudice of the others. At present the practical race, or group of races, is in the ascendant, to the detriment of much that is good.[2]

No more fitting conclusion to this paper could be made than to recall some words of the late Dr. J. J. Garth Wilkinson, written especially in regard to the civilisation and Christianisation of the negro, but bearing on the whole case. He says:

"Our estimate of the African negro especially is largely a sensual induction from what we observe of his colour, his form, his clothing, his habitation, and his simple life. We consider him a hopeless case unless all this can be amended, but always by civilising him. It can, indeed, be very much amended, and towards a comparative Paradise in his hot, but, for him, natural and manageable climates; but civilisation would introduce caricature, and never be flesh of his flesh. On the other hand, civilisation itself wants thorough but gradual amendment, even perhaps more than negrodom, because there is more compact and intelligent unity of mischief in it, more dishonesty, more atheism of life in the garments of religion, and more atheism naked in the gutters of itself; and especially because of writing and storage in memory, which makes vice descend in condensed hereditary volume through the common mind.

"The end should be a compromise, each race missionary to each. If the uncivilised Christian could teach us to be content with our public facilities of life, which he also will have as he needs them, and, for the

[1] It is not intended to imply that the practical nations are without cogitative and emotional faculties, or that the more contemplative and emotional peoples are necessarily without aptitude for practical affairs; but simply that one faculty is predominant in each case.

[2] "Government at the best is necessarily imperfect, because it is conducted by fallible beings; but the rule of one race or nation by another is inevitably bad, though different races may live happily together under the same *régime* if it is their own."—*Racial Supremacy*, by J. G. Godard, p. 80.

rest, to check luxury and lead simple lives according to the best wants of our faculties, bodily, spiritual, and mental, he would again be a reagent missionary indeed; and by his lowly example standing for us against the *auri sacra fames*—the accursed lust of money—he would lighten one grievous burden of the age for the civilised man."[1]

"Civilisation is not necessary to the true Christian religion, nor is it necessary that religion should lead to civilisation as we know it. Wherever it is genuine . . . such religion will produce a gracious decorum, a lovely society, and a state of blessed union and happy intercourse therein. All our clothing and grand inhabitation of houses, our cities, our detail of arts and sciences, our ranks and classes, our distribution of wealth are to be connected with and administered by our Christian life; but the Christian life of the simpler and humbler and higher man can be led with his black wife and children in his hut, and with the huts of his village around him. His path through this world on the way to heaven need never lead him to build Regent Street or Broadway—need not lead him to emulate civilisation. In proportion as he becomes a true member of a higher life in fearing God and keeping His commandments, he will have domestic and social peace, and will flourish at home on a new and purified earth of great abundance; and he will have for a friend the civilisation man, the citizen man, the man of cities."[2]

[1] *The African and the True Christian Religion* (London: James Speirs, 1892) pp. 229 and 230.
[2] *Op. cit.*, pp. 228 and 229.

GEORGE TROBRIDGE

NATIONAL DEFENCE.

PART I.

THE British public pays thirty millions (£29,796,000) for an army, and gets for its money :

Regulars—	Cavalry	14,895	
	Artillery	36,562	
	Engineers	9,865	
	Infantry	104,565	
	Departmental Corps	14,571	
			180,458
	Colonial and native Indian corps		12,491
	Army Reserve		122,000
Militia—	(including permanent staff)	132,408	
	Reserve division	8,000	
	Channel Islands	3,160	
	Malta and Bermuda	2,543	
			146,111
Imperial Yeomanry (including permanent staff)			27,638
Volunteers (including permanent staff)			339,675
	Total		828,373

Exclusive of Indian Establishment, 75,031.

These are the numbers according to the Army Estimates for 1906–7.

The actual number of effectives according to later returns are, however, considerably less, viz. :

Regulars		179,698
Colonial and native Indian corps		11,651
Army Reserve		100,648
Militia (including permanent staff)	94,428	
Reserve division	7,866	
Channel Islands	3,242	
Malta and Bermuda	1,895	
		107,431
Imperial Yeomanry (including permanent staff)		25,399
Volunteers (including permanent staff)		241,708
Total		666,535

Exclusive of regular forces on Indian Establishments, 79,446.

Showing a shortage of	Army Reserve	22,000
	Militia	39,000
	Imperial Yeomanry	2,000
	Volunteers	98,000
	Total	161,000

The shortage on the Army Reserve will be made up automatically, that on the militia and volunteers is serious.

The numbers included in the Indian Establishments are not included in the totals, as they are paid for by the Indian Government, but England has to find the recruits.

In addition there are in India 78,141 regulars, raised in the United Kingdom but paid out of Indian Funds—making a total of roughly three-quarters of a million men contributed by these islands towards the defence of the Empire, of whom nearly 300,000 are professional soldiers exclusively employed on military duty, 200,000 Army reserve, militia, and yeomanry available to reinforce the standing army, and a quarter of a million volunteers, available only to a slight extent for wars over seas, but forming a last resource in the case of invasion.

Gigantic as these figures are, they pale into insignificance when compared with the military forces of other first-class Powers. For example, France maintains a force of 3,363,418, namely:

Active army	652,983
Territorial army	534,613
Reserve of active army	1,817,915
Reserve of territorial army	357,907

Germany of 3,976,500, namely:

Active army	576,500
Reserve	1,100,000
Handwehr, one battalion	900,000
,, two battalions	800,000
Handsturm, three battalions	600,000
Total trained men	3,976,500
Partially trained men	190,000
Untrained men	5,000,000
Grand total	9,866,500

Russia (before the Japanese War):

Active army	1,090,664
Army reserve	1,952,944
Trained militia	700,000
Total	3,743,608

to say nothing of Austria and Italy.

And we must now add Japan to the first-class naval and military Powers.

Among Powers of the second order in respect of permanent forces we may instance United States:

Officers	2,139
Regular Army	24,710
Organised or National Guard	115,000
Reserve militia, untrained	10,000,000[1]

It is a sad commentary on our boasted civilisation that the whole continent of Europe is an armed camp—the people, like dogs held by the leash, straining to fly at one another's throats. Very different was the ideal presented by the forty years' peace after Waterloo, when enthusiasts preached the millennium, and when it was hoped that the rivalry of nations would be confined to industrial and commercial spheres.

For us the Russian War of 1854–6 was a rude awakener—finding us as it did entirely unprepared. This was succeeded in 1857 by the Indian mutiny; in 1859 by the campaign of France and Savoy against Austria in the North of Italy; in 1861–5 by the struggle between the Federals and Confederates in America; in 1863 by the Danish War; in 1866 by the gigantic struggle between Prussia and Austria; and in 1870 by the still more stupendous conflict between Germany and France.

Since that date we have had the Abyssinian Expedition, the Ashanti War, the Zulu and Transvaal Wars, the Afghan Campaign, and numerous other Indian frontier wars, and latterly the great Boer War, whilst on the continent of Europe there have been the Russo-Turkish War, the Greek War, and the United States, joining in the world-wide fray, have had wars in Cuba and the Phillipines. In the Far East we have had our own Burmese War, the French Expedition, the Chino-Japanese War, and overshadowing all, now happily terminated, the war between Russia and Japan for the predominance in Corea and Manchuria.

Having in view the enormous forces arrayed against us—or possibly against us—the question is whether we are prepared to exist on sufferance—by the goodwill of our neighbours, if indeed we do not possess their ill-will rather than their goodwill (their jealousy of our commercial and colonial pre-eminence we certainly possess)—and whether an Englishman is to be the solitary exception to the civilised and uncivilised world including the United States (Militia Law, 1903), and whether, if we are willing to accept such a position, we shall be allowed in the present state of feeling on this planet to retain it. We are but a feeble folk numerically in these islands, but we have succeeded in building up

[1] Appendices Royal Commission, Militia and Volunteers, pp. 1, 2, 4.

such an Empire as the world has never seen before, and the one condition of our retaining it is that we should be able to defend it.

It is well to rely on the Navy as the first line of defence, but it is not well to have no second line of defence.

The Commission presided over by the Prince of Wales has shown that as long as we retain command of sea there is no danger, as has often been asserted, of our being starved out. Our food supplies are under all calculable circumstances safe, though the restriction, or even the mere threat, would be attended by infinite misery and distress.

There is another aspect in which this question presents itself: Are we, the men of England, to abdicate our manhood and leave to chance the protection of our women and children, our wealth and habitations? It is very certain that if the nation were roused to the actual condition of things the answer would be a thundering "No."

We believe that there is no nation combining in so high a degree all the qualities which make for military success. Have we not courage and intelligence? Is it not the case that, while willing to submit to necessary discipline and constitutionally law-abiding, we possess personal initiative and independence? Has not the "thin red line" always been renowned for dogged resistance and fiery onslaught, and is it not a fact that from the time of the old cloth-yard bow and arrow our population has excelled? Do not all our games go to show that in the great pre-requisite of modern war, viz., aimed fire, we ought to be *facile princeps?*

I would go further and say, is there any nation which of its own free will, and without the intervention of Government authority or pressure from its rulers, could have raised such a force as our volunteers, a quarter of a million strong, and maintained it for half a century, not under the smiles of authority, but against the cold shoulder of the authorities both civil and military?

Look again at the spirit displayed by the militia and imperial yeomanry, who were under no obligation to leave these shores during the South African War; and the hereditary spirit of our colonists which surprised both those who knew and those who did not know them.

There must be something wrong when with this magnificent material and splendid spirit our generals come and tell us we are practically defenceless, and our Ministers propose that we should limit our inland preparations to meeting a raid of 5000 or 10,000 men.

The net outcome of the Duke of Norfolk's Commission was that the militia with their present training were not equal to meeting the troops of continental nations even with a considerable stiffening

of regulars, and that our volunteers "Neither in musketry nor in tactical training of the rank and file would be fit to face, with prospect of success, the troops of a continental army."

Major-General H. H. Parr, C.B., C.M.G., says of the militia: "Military experts must hold up their hands in despair at any idea of placing in line half trained and half organised battalions, short of officers, and composed largely of immature lads, against the pick of continental troops led by professional officers."

Of the volunteers he says: "The fate of England would be decided in all probability ere they were in a position to take the field."

Sir Evelyn Wood says:

"If these islands were threatened with invasion to-morrow, thousands of men would come forward and claim that inalienable right of citizenship —permission to fight for their country; but unarmed, untrained men are useless against an organised army, and it appears to me only fair to England and Englishmen to grant every able-bodied man an equal chance of acquiring during peace that military training which will render him fit to take his place in defending these islands against an invader."

Estimating a company of regulars at a 100, Sir E. Wood would class the militia, after having trained and done one year's annual course, at 25 per cent., and a company of volunteers, after having been classed as efficient and done one year's ordinary training, as value for 15 per cent. only. Major-General Sir H. J. T. Hildyard says: "The position of the United Kingdom during the South African War, as far as its power for internal defence was concerned, was most perilous. Both as regards organisation and efficiency, the force available was quite unfitted for any services resisting against properly organised and trained troops." The great concensus of evidence is to the same effect.

What then remains to be done. The Royal Commission on Militia and Volunteers propounds two alternative schemes according as the auxiliary forces are intended to act in conjunction with a sufficient force of regulars, or are intended to form an independent force for the defence of the Kingdom, in the absence of the greater portion of the regular Army.

In the first case the minimum requirements formulated by them to enable the auxiliary forces to be an assistance and not a drawback to the regulars, to justify their existence for the purpose for which they are enrolled, and not to be a source of dangers and anxiety by their excessive numbers and want of organisation, are as follows:

For the militia:

(*a*) Six months continuous training in the first year of service.

(*b*) To be followed by not less than six weeks training in the second, third, and fourth years.

(*c*) Enlistment for eight years, instead of for successive periods of five years as as present.

(*d*) The organisation of brigades and divisions with permanent officers.

For the volunteers the cardinal principle must be adopted that no volunteer, whether officer, non-commissioned officer or private, should be put to expense on account of his service, and subject to this governing condition, the chief points recommended are:

(*a*) A separate department and head at the War Office.

(*b*) The formation of brigades and divisions.

(*c*) A portion of the capitation grant to be issued on the basis of establishment of companies, not individuals.

(*d*) Concentration of efforts on special and essential points.

(*e*) Training in camp for fourteen days.

(*f*) Rifle ranges to be provided by the State.

(*g*) Transport and equipment for mobilisation also to be provided.

(*h*) Tactical schools to be provided for the officers.

(*i*) Increase of attendance other than camps of exercise.

If, however, the purpose is to produce a force which, without substantial help from the regular Army, can be relied upon to defeat an invader, then the Commission sees no alternative to a modified conscription.

The male population attaining the age of twenty in the United Kingdom annually is 380,000. If half this number were disqualified on account of health, profession, economical circumstances or other causes of exemption, there would still remain 190,000 or 200,000 available, who should receive one year's continuous training with specially qualified officers (not necessarily in barracks) the first year, and one or two annual periods of a few weeks exercise or manœuvre afterwards.

In three years the Commission estimates that this would give about 350,000 men (after due allowance for natural wastage) available and efficient for a defence army; and obviously as years went on, though the report of the Commission does not explicitly state this, an increasing number of trained men which, if a secondary liability to be called up in case of emergency were insisted on, would give enormous numbers, comparable to the gigantic forces of continental States—in fact, a nation in arms. It is difficult for the imagination to grasp the immense change this would effect in our social and national existence.

Another plan which is before the public is that of the National Service League. The League proposes to draw recruits from young men between the ages of eighteen and twenty-two at their

convenience, to subject them to two months training in camps of exercise the first year?

(*b*) Fourteen days training in the second, third and fourth years.

(*c*) The League would divert one-third of the annual contingent to the Navy.

(*d*) They also base their proposals on a course of physical training on scientific principles and military drill as part of the educational course in all schools.

Their numbers starting from the basis of 380,000 males reaching the age of twenty annually work out somewhat differently. They estimate that 40 per cent. would fall away on medical grounds, reducing the number available to 228,000 a year deducting from this number:

For boys enlisted in the Navy	16,000
Police and constabulary	5,000
Regular forces	35,000
Mercantile marine	18,000
Emigration and special causes	10,000
	84,000
There remain 144,000. Of these, one-third = 48,000 would be taken up for naval militia, leaving 96,000 annually; or, allowing 10 per cent for annual wastage, the total land militia under training by the end of the fourth year would be, roughly	330,000
And of sea militia	165,000
Grand total	495,000

Another scheme has been propounded by Major-General Sir E. M. Barrow in the *National Review* for October 1904, under the title, "Army Reform on National Lines."

He proposes to divide the United Kingdom into 150 battalion districts instead of the present 69 regimental districts—each such district to have a population of about 280,000. All boys in these battalions should be registered at ten years of age, and instruction on drill given in all elementary schools by the schoolmasters under the supervision of the training staff. In State-aided schools the grant in aid should be dependent on this being done.

Taking the total annual birth-rate of boys in the United Kingdom as 600,000, and the number of those who survive to reach the age of seventeen as 400,000, he assumes that three-fourths are physically and mentally qualified for military training. This would give about 2000 youths of seventeen, whom we may call cadets, to be trained every year in each "Battalion District." The cadets should be trained in two batches, as it is not desirable to have more than 800 or 1000 in each batch.

The staff of a battalion district to consist of:

1	Lieut.-Colonel	150
2	Majors	300
1	Adjutant	150
1	Quarter-master	150
1	Serjeant-major	150
2	Privates	300
1	Storeman	150
9	Total for 150 Battalion Districts	1,350

And the staff for a company district, at the rate of eight companies to a battalion, would consist of:

		Total for 150 Battalion Districts.
1	Captain	1,200
2	Lieutenants	2,400
1	Colour-sergeant	1,200
4	Sergeants	4,800
8	Lance-sergeants and corporals	9,600
1	Bugler	1,200
2	Privates (clerk and storeman)	2,400
19 × 8 × 150 = Total =		22,800

The training of cadets to last one year; in the winter, locally in towns and villages; in the summer, in camp. At the end of the cadet training, or, at all events, by the time the youth is nineteen years of age, he will be compelled to elect to serve in one of the following categories—for the periods and under the conditions stated against each.

I.	The navy and marines	As at present.
II.	The army	Nine years with colours, three years with reserve.
III	Imperial militia	Six years, plus six years in V., VI., or VII.
IV.	County militia	Six years, plus six years in V. or VII.
V.	Volunteers	Optional, but with six years in VII.
VI.	Imperial militia reserve	Completion of twelve years for those originally in III.
VII.	County militia reserve	Twelve years. No training, but liability for IV. or V. in case of invasion or great emergency.

The Imperial militia is to be an entirely new organisation. It is proposed to form 150 battalions corresponding to the 150 "battalion districts," to be carved out of the present 69 regimental districts.

The officers and sergeants would be those of the "battalion District," that is, regulars, the rest of the rank and file being Imperial militia.

The conditions would be:

(1) Liability to foreign service.

(2) Six months preliminary training with a regular unit in the first year of service.

(3) One month's annual training with the Imperial militia battalion.

(4) Pay at one shilling a day during this month.

(5) Reserve at sixpence a day for the rest of the year.

(6) Pay at General Service rates if mobilised.

The preliminary drill would be put in with one of the forty-six home centres proposed by Mr Arnold Foster.

Promotion from the ranks should be largely availed of for officering the Imperial militia.

One finishes reading such a scheme with a gasp, and asks, are we Spartans? One sound point, however, appears in it, viz., the early training of youth in schools as part of the compulsory curriculum of education. As has been justly remarked, the elementary schools are kept up mainly at the expense of the classes who do not send their children to such schools, and who might fairly insist on the instruction including what goes to the very root of good citizenship. The working classes would, however, themselves welcome it with open arms, and the higher classes would not be behind them in embracing a system that makes for health, exercise and patriotism.

Mr. Henry Birchenough contributed a thoughtful article on compulsory physical education and compulsory military training to the *Nineteenth Century Review* for July 1904 which is practically a commentary on the report of the Duke of Norfolk's commission on the militia and volunteers.

The writer investigates the industrial and social side rather than the military side of the question, and maintains that the objections urged against compulsory military training do not possess anything like the weight commonly attributed to them. These objections are that compulsory military training involves deplorable economic waste inasmuch as it withdraws young men for a time from the pursuit of industries; that it dislocates industrial life, and would never be accepted by employers; and further the fear is expressed that if it were adopted it would bring with it all the admitted evils of continental conscription and the barrack system.

Meeting the first point it is maintained that the loss of time involved in submitting every able-bodied male to say a year's military training is more than counterbalanced by the extraordinary improvement in national physique, and by the acquisition of habits of ready obedience, attention, and combined action, which have so high an importance in industrial life.

He quotes Sir Joseph Whitworth to the effect that "the labour of a man who has gone through a course of military drill is worth eighteenpence a week more than that of one untrained."

He denies that there is any considerable dislocation of industrial life in France and Germany. His proposal is that military training (or naval) should be made compulsory for able-bodied youth between the ages of, say fifteen and eighteen as a branch of, or as a continuation of, ordinary education. Military training wouldrank as an additional branch besides elementary, secondary, and technical education, being most nearly allied by its compulsory character to elementary education.

The duty of carrying out the law should be imposed upon the local authorities—the county or borough council acting through a special committee appointed *ad hoc*, whose duty it would be to furnish, out of funds provided from Imperial sources, all the necessary expenses for instructors, drill grounds, and possibly accoutrements and ranges.

The whole system would rest on a purely local basis like any other branch of education. All lads until they had attained the age of nineteen, and reached a fixed standard of efficiency, would have to undergo the prescribed course of training in the locality where they for the time being happened to reside.

This would not cause any serious disturbance to national life, and could probably be carried out in the case of the vast mass of the population during the abundant leisure which is now at the disposal of all classes. If any difficulty should arise, in order to meet it there would be little objection to a further slight shortening of the hours during which "young persons" may be employed.

Lord Meath, whose patriotism and philanthropy shine in all he undertakes, has also contributed an article to the same periodical for May 1905.

He says, to justify universal military training for lads, two questions must be answered in the affirmative.

(1) Is some form of military training necessary for the safety of the Empire?

(2) Would such training given in youth be sufficient to meet the military requirements?

He maintains an affirmative answer to the first question, based on the extent of the Empire—one-fifth of the surface of the earth and about the same proportion of the population—and the numerous forces that could be brought against us—which he estimates at 11,000,000 trained soldiers. He says that patriotism *plus* 5*s.* a day enabled us to put 230,000 men into the field in South Africa, and even if we add to these 200,000 of the Indian Army, our total is insufficient.

What about the ballot advocated by Lord Wemyss? Lord Meath considers that this is more impracticable than universal service.

What of conscription? This he considers the British public would never stand, except after a crushing defeat, and then it would be too late. He sums up the objections to adult military service as follows:

(1) Infringement on the liberty of the subject.

(2) Interference with his industrial pursuits.

(3) Disorganisation caused to trade, commerce, and agriculture.

(4) Moral objection to housing large numbers of men in barracks.

Hence he concludes that a cadet system for all boys over fourteen is the only solution.

He quotes Lord Roberts to the effect that lads who have been effectually trained would probably become quite as efficient soldiers as would reserve men after they had been away from the colours from three or four years. He adduces the authority of Dr. McNamara, M.P., of Lord Rosebery and Sir Ian Hamilton, who "would feel very confident of obtaining creditable results if he were placed in command of a mounted infantry brigade composed of boys who had been previously well grounded in handling arms, skirmishing, and the attack."

Lord Methuen believes there is a great future before the movement.

Lord Dundonald (in Canada), Lord Charles Beresford, Sir Edward Barrow are also quoted, and Sir G. Taubman Goldie.

Canada has a cadet system, so has Australia, where the cadets are divided into those attending school over twelve, and those who have left school from fourteen to nineteen.

In Natal in 1902 there were 2236 cadets against the available manhood of the Colony of 12,000: in New Zealand 4126 in July 1902, and 12,000 in 1904.

At home the War Office will only supply arms on the condition that the boys wear a uniform. Lord Meath hopes the Government will grant one serviceable rifle to every fifteen lads of the Lads Drill Association as a first step to the universal training of youth to the use of arms. Mr. Avery, the talented author of the *Times* history of the war in South Africa, has published a work entitled *The Problem of the Army*. He starts by asserting that the "Strategic front" of the British Empire lies in a straight line from the Cape to Kamskatcha, and contemplates the move of divisions between India and Australia for summer drills. Of an army for home defence he does not tell us much, but apparently the British

taxpayer is to keep up an enormous mobile force within striking distance of the "Strategic front," and India and the Colonies are to reap the benefit.

Mr. Avery gives in Appendix I. the approximate peace and mobilisation strength of the proposed military establishment (British first and second line troops only):

A. Garrison and other sedentary forces:	
Royal garrison regiment	24,000
Garrison artillery, engineers	22,500
Imperial reserve regiment	6,000
Total	52,500
B. On permanent war footing:	
India and Egypt	80,000
C. Home establishment:	
1. Peace footing:	
Regulars, including cadre battalions	100,000
Militia and yeomanry	110,000
Army reserve	160,000
Militia reserve	50,000
Total	420,000
2. War footing—In the field:	
Eight divisions regulars	120,000
Twelve divisions militia	180,000
Total	300,000
Available for drafts:	
Army and militia reserve	80,000
Regulars and militia left behind on mobilisation	40,000
Grand Total	420,000

He does not, however, explain where and how these numbers are to be raised, and while admitting the principle that no scheme is admissible that cannot be carried out by a progressive development of our existing system, the connection between his scheme and the present state of affairs is not apparent. He recommends increased pay and lengthening of service with the colours, but without investigating how these changes will be received by the recruit-giving classes.

F. Treffry.

(*To be continued.*)

THE WANING PRESTIGE OF GERMANY.

PART I.

THERE are indications of an attempt to isolate Germany. The promoters of this policy seem bent upon placing Germany in the position in which Bismarck had France when he tied her hand and foot in order to gain time to cement the new Confederation. What a change has occurred since the Berlin Conference! Any one who was at Algeciras during the sessions of the Conference, and was permitted to sit in that little room on the day when the compact was signed, less important in itself than in its unwritten import, must have had visions flitting before his eyes of the great part which Bismarck enacted at that earlier Conference. How he stalked about in his lordly way, with the prestige of three victorious wars resting upon his shoulders; he was completing his task of isolating France. But now this work has been mostly undone. Germany has had, however, her breathing spell, and in the time which has elapsed has perhaps consolidated her Empire. But this will never be certainly known till some supreme test comes.

England now sits at the head of the table of European nations. The prestige which she lost in the Boer War she has regained: it is a long while since she has occupied so commanding a position as she does to-day. Besides the European friendships she is regaining, she has gained that of the United States, which she never before possessed since we were a nation. France sits upon her right hand. This is not the France of 1870: it is not the tottering, discontented, priest-taught, rattle-headed Empire of Napoleon the Little, which was so easily led by the nose or under the sway of an emotional nobility. It is a new, a regenerated France, a France of the common people. It is now a republic, apparently strong and established, and governed by the representatives of her thrifty, industrious, prosperous farmers and middle classes; for there are no peasants to-day as the term was used a hundred years ago. Now France is a nation of forty-one millions of people, rich or well-to-do, patient, persevering, educated, enlightened. She is the garden of Europe, possessing some of its best land, almost

all of which is under cultivation, and little of it given up to pasturage. She has established, at vast expense, a national school system; has erected school-houses in every city and village, in which a new generation has been taught loyally to love the republic. She has hamstrung the disloyalty of the Catholic hierarchy, and destroyed the Concordat. Her eighth legislative election has just occurred, and the enemies of the republic, whether reactionaries or communists, have been ignominiously defeated. Nor is she now, if she ever really was, the France which Dumas, Zola and the prurient novelists have painted. How these fiction-mongers have maligned their countrymen! What a pity it is that so many of our popular notions about these people should have been learned from these sensationalists!

Italy is drawing nearer England at this table of the nations. Nor is this the Italy of 1870, which the Hapsburgs and Bourbons had kicked and strangled, harassed, robbed, brow-beaten and ground beneath their heels for so many generations. It is another and a united Italy, a monarchy in name, but a republic in reality. The House of Savoy are not Italians, and the Italians know it. Nor has Victor Emanuel failed to hear the voice of the great minority in the recent elections. Italy is shaking off her lethargy, sloughing off her poverty and awakening from her enforced sleep. She is better governed now than she was in the days when she wore swaddling-clothes. All of Northern Italy is a beehive of industry. Rome is forgetting the traditions of the Church and becoming a modern city. The hordes of travellers, hundreds of thousands yearly, unlike the hordes which once invaded her, are helping to make the eternal city an Italian Paris. And Southern Italy, too, and even Sicily, is beginning to feel the touch of the wand of prosperity. Many of their sons are going to America. We find them thrifty, temperate, industrious, patient and good citizens. They are gradually lifting from their countrymen the veil of prejudice which has enveloped them. They come, as all immigrants do, to better themselves and doubtless succeed. But they are only bricks from the same kilns as those who remain at home. These sometimes seem to us idle and lazy; but let us not forget their narrow circumstances and poor opportunities. Were they but given a chance to work most of them would improve it as eagerly as those who have come to us.

It was Gladstone's bugle-call which apprised his countrymen of the horrors of the Neapolitan prisons and the wrongs perpetrated upon that struggling people. It was England that furnished a home for Mazzini and for the noble band of patriots who preached the gospel of a united Italy. It was English philanthropists, too, who fed them for years with the rations for their propagandist war and with much of the money which equipped Garibaldi's "one

thousand." And it was to England that he came for some of the delights of appreciation. Is it strange then that the sons of free Italy turned their grateful eyes towards the people who helped their fathers expel their oppressors?

Under Bismarck's persuasion Italy entered the Triple Alliance. And doubtless it has been a benefit; and if it has been no especial protection, it is because she has needed none. But the impulse and example of Germany have helped her to make an army, and an army which, under a good commander, will be a terror to her enemies. It has impelled her to make a good navy, for Germany, if a silent, has been a watchful partner. She has seen to it that her ally, if her help should ever be needed, would be of some benefit to her. But the alliance is not a perpetual league. Both France and England seem beckoning her to come with them, and her footsteps seem to be turned in their direction. It now looks, notwithstanding official assurances, as if the Triple Alliance would soon become a rope of sand. Public opinion seems to be against it in Italy.

In interpreting the recent royal telegrams we must not forget that neither Victor Emanuel nor the Austrian Emperor controls the foreign policy of his country. The people in fact control them by their suffrages. The habitual ferment in Hungary has diminished the Emperor's prestige, and there are powerful influences, political as well as popular, drawing Italy towards the Western Powers.

Spain and Portugal sit near England at this table. Nor is Spain unmindful of the debt she owes the country which spent her blood and treasure without stint to help her expel the legions of Napoleon from her soil. It was here that the great conqueror of Europe met his first reverses. It was Wellington who drove his armies from Lisbon back across Spain into France, and inspired that wonderful uprising of the Spanish people, which is one of the noblest chapters in the history of that century. Can the Spaniard ever forget his deliverer?

Spain has been for long, long years trying to keep the lands which Columbus discovered. The struggle has been a desolating one. Her sons and her treasure have been spent in vain; the energies which should have been used in developing her own fair land have been wasted. Her country has been left without improvements, and her children without education. Only one in three of them can even read, a task which a year's good schooling might have accomplished. But the waste is over now. The young eagles have left their mother's nest and built nests for themselves throughout South America. Even Cuba and the Philippines are hers no longer.

But the Spaniard is a noble fellow. He is honest. His word is as good as his bond. He is brave, he is truthful, he is temperate,

thrifty, prudent, and fairly industrious. He is sometimes called proud. He may have been once, but this folly has all been crushed out of him. He has little to be proud of except his sterling character. He is dignified in manner and grave by temperament; he has not the vivacity of his French or Italian cousin. It is this which has been sometimes mistaken for pride. His country, in this year of our Lord at least, is a succession of green fields, villages and hillsides from Algeciras to the Bay of Biscay. Its roads are bad, in fact it has few roads which the Frenchman would dignify by that name. Its railroads are slow and poorly managed, and too much of its produce is still carried upon the backs of donkeys. Think of it! Donkeys, in this enlightened century! But this is not altogether the Spaniard's fault. It is largely the fault of his rulers; they would not encourage road-building. There are some parts of his country in need of irrigation. This again is not his fault, not wholly so at least, for his energies have been wasted elsewhere. But a new star seems to be dawning over Spain. If the country can only have a long peace; if it can also have a wise king and half a dozen wise rulers, who love their country and its people better than themselves, and would encourage the building of good roads, the opening of good schools, and the adoption anew of the system of irrigation the Moors introduced; if they will only help the Spaniard to help himself, Spain, with its twenty millions of people, may in a generation become once more a great country. May not something be expected from the English marriage and the impulse and opportunities it may bring?

Denmark, Sweden and Norway are sympathetic observers of this new alignment of the Powers. They are small countries and not powerful, as the great nations count strength in these days, and are incapable alone of resisting the aggression of any one of these, or else Schleswig-Holstein would not have been sliced from the map of Denmark. But they all have representative governments, and the genius of no one of them sits upon a stack of bayonets. Norway, a constitutional monarchy in name, is in reality a republic. Sweden, likewise a constitutional monarchy, and possessing a nobility, has no sympathy with autocratic tendencies, and seems to be on the point of adopting universal suffrage. Denmark is also a government by the people and for the people. England, who refused so recently to sit still and allow France to become the prey of Germany, could hardly afford to sit with folded hands while any great Power pushed further westward under her nose in either the Baltic or the North Sea.

Austria rendered some slack allegiance to Germany at Algeciras. She did not exactly enact the part of a duelling second, as has been suggested, but rather that of an independent, self-respecting friend of peace. Austria is busy now with her own affairs. The Hun-

garians are struggling to preserve and increase their own power. The battle for universal suffrage is still in progress in both countries. And Europe is waiting with bated breath to see what will happen upon the demise of the Austrian Emperor, now at the age of seventy-six, to see if there will be any disruption of the Empire, any attempt of the Germans to join their namesakes in the North, any attempt of the New Germany to stretch out its arms towards Trieste and the Mediterranean.

There are not a few well-informed people who believe that the Emperor is expecting that day will make Germany a real Mediterranean Power, and will neglect no opening which promises this result. Are not some of the promoters of the new policy among them?

And what of Russia? With whom does she affiliate the most cordially? She too is occupied at present with her own affairs. She who so often has been either the arbiter or disturber of Europe, is now trying to preserve her own peace. And unless she is more fortunate in establishing legislative government than most countries have been, than England and France and Spain for instance were, it will be a generation at least before the machinery works smoothly enough to trust it upon the sea of political aggression. Russia and England have been for a long while political rivals. It was England who did so much to keep Russia away from Constantinople and out of the Mediterranean; to prevent her route to India from being endangered; and it was Russia who was always creeping a little nearer to Northern India. She has been for years the nightmare of English statesmen. But now they can sleep as sweetly as a sailor on a summer sea. Nor is there any present danger that Russia will reach Asiatic waters by the Yellow Sea. Japan has closed that avenue of approach.

But will England and Russia be for the years immediately to come patient enemies or sympathetic friends? This question is now under discussion. Will they settle their present differences and agree for a while to stifle their rivalries? The friendliness recently shown in relation to matters in Egypt, Tibet and Persia, shows that the period of mutual distrust has passed. If we are to believe what we read, this question may soon be progressing towards a happy solution, When nations, like individuals, meet each other face to face and talk over their differences, instead of standing apart and bombarding each other with subtle disquisitions upon their respective rights and pugnacious expositions of their points of view—how much more can be accomplished. This is businesslike. Commercial questions are vastly important nowadays. And why can they not be settled best by the usual commercial methods? Two business men would eliminate their unimportant grievances; would settle as many important ones as possible, and leave the rest to the judgment of arbitrators. A liberal apprecia-

tion goes further than a narrow pugnacity in settling disputes. It is by following such methods that avenues of trade are broadened, and ships which have been heretofore stopped in the offing, are permitted to sail into foreign ports under full steam. English examples and precedents occupy a unique and important position in guiding the political changes which are now occurring in Russia. The leading members of the Duma seem to have read thoroughly the history of her struggles to establish parliamentary government.

What a change has occurred in the foreign policy of England since the close of the Boer War! Then she was isolated, she stood alone. And she thought herself fortunate in her position. Lord Salisbury used sometimes to pride himself upon this splendid isolation. But whether it was a wise policy or not, no sooner was it put to the test in that war than it was given up. England became tired of being friendless. She suffered so much criticism at home and in other countries, especially in Germany and France, that she began to pine for friendships. The death of Queen Victoria brought King Edward to the throne; and he seems to have realised at once the value of international friendships. Whether he was the Columbus of this discovery or only the Sebastian Cabot may never be generally known.

But friendships, whether they are personal or national, are seldom formed without the seekers for them are willing to show themselves friendly. An iceberg can make no friends. Where did England first turn for a friend? To whom did she first extend her hand? She turned towards America. She had been friendly towards us during our little war with Spain. She had declined to accept Austria's invitation to embarrass us with interference or offers of mediation. Some other countries had not been so backward, and we were touched by her gracious act of kindness. We appreciated it. We were even grateful. We had not been especially good friends with her for a long while, perhaps had never been since the days before the Revolution. The war of 1812 and the letting loose of the *Alabama* to prey upon our commerce had left bruises which the Irish were always rubbing into open sores. But the Irish had now lost much of their power to exasperate and create dissension. The older men to whom these grievances were a living memory were passing away. A younger generation was ruling the country. They said the *Alabama* differences had been settled by the award of arbitration, and that that trouble had become history. They said that blood was thicker than water, that we were both children of the same mother, spoke the same language, possessed the same history, the same religion, the same idols, the same ideals, the same heroes, had similar laws, courts, tastes, purposes, ambitions and forms of

government. Both of the countries believed that public opinion ought to rule a land, that no government could last which did not possess the goodwill of the governed, that any government which sits upon the cannon's breech sits upon its sepulchre. Our country, said these makers of American public opinion, believes that the two great oceans are our fortresses, that the time has not come, if it is ever to come, for us to meddle with the affairs of Europe. We want to be let alone, and we are willing to let others alone. We want no alliance except alliances of the head and heart. But we do want friends, and the friends we want most are our English cousins, who worship the same idols as we do. The battle of Manilla has opened a new era for us. Fortunately or unfortunately we have become a world power and must act our part. These were the sentiments of the new generation of public leaders, and these men were largely in the majority.

No sooner had England found a friend in the Western Republic, a natural, instinctive, and not an artificial or treaty-made friend, than she made an alliance with Japan. How much this alliance was a consequence of her newly found friendship, how much it was simply only a sequence of events, it is not easy to say. No one perhaps can say. But is it unlikely that she formed that alliance, and incurred thereby the risk of a war with Russia, with less hesitation because she had found such a cordial response from across the Atlantic? This alliance gave Japan more confidence to face Russia, to demand the fulfilment of her promise to evacuate Manchuria, and relieve the Island Empire of a constant menace. And this has found a cordial sympathy, if not an aggressive encouragement, in America. And the war which this element had made possible resulted in the humiliation of England's traditional enemy. She may again become a menace, but probably not until she has put her own house in order. For the present England can breathe easier.

France had been chafing for years at Germany's supremacy, and was anxious to strengthen her own position among the nations of Europe. She, too, believed in a government by public opinion, and not by force. The sword was not an agency she loved. She had been forced to arm herself to the teeth because Germany had done so; she had never forgotten the days when spiked helmets had marched through the streets of Paris, and when a German garrison had been encamped in the Bois de Boulogne. She had not forgotten the seizure of Alsace and Lorraine. These still were words to conjure with. Nor had she forgotten the humiliating surrender at Sedan, nor the milliards of francs she had paid to ransom her territory from the despoiler. The taking of her provinces she still hoped might prove a political blunder. It had already compelled Germany to become a nation in arms, and had sometimes exasperated

her own people almost beyond control. But what she could not forget she had tried to endure. She had bowed her back to her burden, had organised and established a new Government, had made a new system of national education. And by its means her young men and her maidens, her boys and her girls, had been taught to love the republic which the priests would have taught them to hate. She had risen again from the ashes, and had become strong, stable, and prosperous. She had created an army of republican patriots. And when will a people who have fed for a century upon the memories of Napoleon's two hundred victories, who visit his tomb to-day in scores, be anything but good soldiers? The new men who had risen to political power were the children of her merchants, her traders, her shopkeepers, editors, bankers, lawyers, and tillers of the soil, and had been trained in a harder school than the old nobility. They were more conservative in their instincts, stable in their opinions, patient, considerate and trustworthy. No brusqueness of manner, such as the King of Prussia had shown at Ems to the French Ambassador in 1870, and which Bismarck had falsified into an intentional insult, was likely again to set a French Cabinet by the ears and provoke another war. They were men who might be willing to dismiss sometimes a Cabinet Minister, if, by this sacrifice of their pride, they could placate a bullying enemy and prevent a useless war. They seemed to possess some of that mental composure which makes the men across the channel so stable, so slow to take offence at trifles.

CHARLES G. FALL.

(*To be continued.*)

HOW THE SCOTTISH SCHOOLS WERE FREED FROM DENOMINATIONAL CONTROL THIRTY YEARS AGO.

THE connection of the State with education is much older in Scotland than in England. Over two centuries ago—in 1696 a school was established by law in every Scotch parish, while the English dealings of the State, with a national system of education, have not yet competed forty years. This longer experience of the State may account not a little for the fact that some of the problems confronting England at the present time were settled in the Northern Kingdom over thirty years ago, so that a short review of that settlement may be helpfully suggestive in the difficulties of the moment.

Though there was thus early State dealing with education in Scotland, it took the form of delegating its powers to the church, and thus before and up to 1843 the general education of Scotland was practically in the hands of the Established Church. There was a school in every parish of the country, which supplemented by the burgh schools, under a legal provision, that every royal burgh was required to maintain a burgh school out of the common good—That is the property held under its charter of erection. That the parish schools played not only a useful, but a noble part in the development of Scottish life, is well known, and though legal incentive was seldom used, the burghs also did no small service to the town children by affording them first-rate commercial academies controlled by local public authorities.

In 1843, the Disruption took place in the Established Church, and the Free Church was formed. The leaders of the Free Church thought that power would ultimately reside with the religious body that controlled the schools of the country, and forthwith they took steps to provide not only for the theological training of their students, but the Assembly gave directions that a Free Church school should be erected in every parish, with training-colleges for teachers—called Normal Schools, as in the Establishment.

Though the cynical may smile at the sectarian spirit that prompted the formation of these new schools there can be no two opinions as to the enormous benefit their creation conferred on Scotland. It

added enormously to the educational facilities of the country and the spirit of emulation among parents to educate their children grew almost into a national passion for education itself among both parties. Besides the direct results of a general diffusion of knowledge among the whole people, it accounted for the fact that almost at the head of every great undertaking in the country during the latter half of the last century, there were men sprung from humble origin, who owed their success in life to the foundations laid in the common schools of the country. The public spirit this educational interest engendered also did not a little towards the preparation of the popular mind for, and the development of a class of men capable of, being entrusted with the public management of education later on.

Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that Lord Advocate Young—the present Lord Young who retired from the Scottish Bench a few months ago—declared thirty years after the Disruption that Scotland had outgrown its educational clothes, and a new suit must be made. Nearly all Scotland agreed with that, but the difficulty was the fashion and cut of the new clothes. The same Lord Advocate undertook the task of cutting the cloth by introducing to the House of Commons the Education Act for Scotland in 1872.

In explaining the Bill to the House he summarised its objects thus:

"First, that the Imperial money voted by Parliament for promoting national education should be administered by the Government, and not by a statutory Board, which would be responsible to the Government and for whose proceedings, consequently, the Government could not be responsible to Parliament. Second, that a popularly elected School Board should be forthwith established in every parish and burgh, and that the duties of each School Board should be, first, to manage all rate-supported schools within the district; and thereafter, to impose and levy such local rates as should be necessary. Third, that there should be one uniform system of management, applicable without distinction to all public rate-supported schools, either existing before the Act or established under the Act, to supply the ascertained deficiency. Fourth, that the religious teaching was to be given at such hours that would not interrupt or interfere with secular instruction, and that children were at liberty to withdraw from it without losing any part of the secular instruction."

With the passing of the Act, all the parish church schools, under the sway generally of the Established Church, and burgh schools under the care of the town authorities, came automatically under the management of the new School Boards. It was not so, however, with the schools of the Free Church, which were private property. The Act did not compel the transference of these schools, it merely provided machinery whereby they might be handed over to the new educational authorities. It is important to notice too that the *School Boards were not empowered under the Act to purchase these*

schools, they could only accept them as a gift. Their trustees must make the first advance, and with a two-thirds majority, of the persons administrating the trust in favour of it, the boards were empowered to take the schools over and free the managers from all further liability of maintenance. In 1872, when the Act was passed, there 548 Free Church Schools, with 584 teachers. Two years after it was passed, it was reported to the General Assembly of the Free Church that 139 of her schools had been transferred to the School Boards, and 284 had discontinued teaching altogether, and 119 congregations were carrying on the schools for a time. But these, too, soon all passed away, and with them the last vestige of direct religious control over the schools on the part of the great Presbyterian bodies, who constitute the great mass of the Scottish people.

"That, as it has been the custom in the public schools of Scotland to give religious instruction to children whose parents did not object to the instruction so given, but with liberty to parents, without forfeiting any of the other advantages of the schools, to elect that their children should not receive such instruction, and it is expedient that the managers of public schools shall be at liberty to continue the said custom."

This was given effect to in the "conscience clause," whereby every public school in receipt of public money is open to children of all denominations; that the parent may withdraw the child at instruction in religious subjects, and that such religious teaching shall be given at the beginning or end of the meeting, which time was to be approved of by the Scotch Education Department. In Scotland there never was any great difference of opinion between the Churches, outside the Roman Catholics and Episcopalians—small sections of the population, as to the nature of the religious instruction given in the schools. The three great Presbyterian bodies were already agreed that the Bible and Shorter Catechism should be taught. The question at issue was, therefore, one of management, and not of dogma. That being so, the Act gave no definition as to the character or scope of religious instruction beyond what is contained in the preamble quoted. It was accordingly left to School Boards to adopt such religious formularies as they might choose, and the principle of "use and wont" was acted on throughout the country, and the Bible and Shorter Catechism remained, and remain to this day the text-books of the schools.

While this satisfied the Presbyterians and the great bulk of the population, it left the Roman Catholics and the Episcopalians at a disadvantage. But under a clause in the Act, which prescribes that no parliamentary grant shall be made in respect of instruction on religious subjects, or to schools established after the passing of the Act, there is an exception under which they claim denominational teaching, viz., "Unless the Department is satisfied that no

sufficient provision exists for such children, regard being had to religious beliefs of their parents." And so in this indirect way the Roman Catholics and Episcopalians received parliamentary grants to purely denominational schools.

Under the Act of 1803 schoolmasters were examined and approved by Presbytery and required to sign the confession of the faith, and the formula of the Church of Scotland. In the Act of 1861 this was modified so that instead of Presbyteries, examiners of the Universities were to examine the schoolmasters. Parochial schoolmasters were also relieved by it from signing the confession of faith and the formular of the Established Church, but had to declare they would not teach opinions opposed to the Bible or Catechism, nor do anything prejudicial to the Church of Scotland. Under the Act of 1872 these tests all lapsed, and no expression of religious belief was required of the teachers appointed under it.

If the true historical perspective be maintained, it will be seen that the Act of 1872, while it brought about many changes, was evolutionary rather than revolutionary in its character. It gave popular control of the schools to Scotland after a long spell of preparation for it. While it abolished direct management of the churches the results still give a large control of the Boards to Presbyterian ministers and leading laymen. In the recent School Board election in Glasgow, a United Free Church Minister was returned at the head of the poll with 67,799 votes. The Glasgow Board and many other Boards still open their meeting with prayer, so that their composition is not wholly secularised. If the schools have lost in anything religious and moral by separation from the churches they have gained enormously in attendance, splendid schools, fit equipment and educational results. At one time, apparently in Scotland, "only barrones and free-halders that are of substance were expected to put their eldest sonnes and aires to the schules," but this Act provided education for "the whole people." Supplemented by the Carnegie Trust, it enables the humblest in the land to aspire to climb the ladder of learning, so that the Board School scholars jostle the scholars of the great and ancient public schools of England in Oxford and Cambridge with some success.

L. M. M.

"SHIRLEY" LAND.

ALTHOUGH more than half a century has passed since the death of Charlotte Brontë, her popularity shows no sign of waning, but, on the contrary, there seems lately to have been somewhat of a revival of interest in her works. Readers, of course, will always have their preferences, but there is no doubt that amongst the people of her native county of Yorkshire, of all Miss Brontë's novels the one which most appeals to them is *Shirley*, which, for the first time, divulged the secret of the authorship of a book that was already winning its way into favour. The publication of *Jane Eyre* had revealed a new writer, and speculation was rife as to "his" identity. With the issue of *Shirley* concealment was no longer possible. It is true that in a letter to her friend, Miss Nussey, Charlotte Brontë had written to the following effect:

"You are not to suppose any of the characters in *Shirley* intended as literal portraits. It would not suit the rules of art, nor of my own feelings, to write in that style. We only suffer reality to suggest, never to dictate. The heroines are abstractions, and the heroes also. Qualities I have seen, loved, and admired are here and there put in as decorative gems to be preserved in the setting."

But the scenery described in the novel, though disguised under fictitious names, and the characters there drawn were so true to nature and life, that residents of the district no sooner read the book than they at once recognised both scenes and persons, and the discovery of the author, though veiled by a *nom de guerre*, quickly followed.

In the years that have elapsed since *Shirley* was written, the march of progress has effected many changes. There is one particular village, however, which seems to have resisted with remarkable success the modern craze for improvements, and to have gone on its way unmoved by the more enterprising zeal of its neighbours. This is Gomersal (locally pronounced Gummersal), situate on a pleasant elevation, and hemmed in, as it were, by such important towns as Leeds, Dewsbury, Huddersfield, Halifax, Morley, and Heckmondwike. One of the oldest parishes in England, Gomersal occupied a position of influence when some of the boroughs by which it is surrounded were insignificant hamlets. The curious may trace from the Domesday Book, or other ancient documents, these evidences of its venerable origin, affording testimony of its

former fame and standing. It is to be feared that it has been content to live on its traditions. At any rate, whether this is the case or not, it cannot be disputed that it has not advanced with that rapidity which has distinguished many of the West Riding towns engaged, like Gomersal, in the woollen trade. It seems rather to have been invaded somewhat against its will by the waves of progress, and only to have succumbed to the inevitable when it was no longer possible to stem the flowing tide. The spell of lethargy having been broken, it is not improbable that Gomersal may, in the near future, keep pace in activity and development with its neighbours and rivals.

A special interest attaches to Gomersal, because of all places in the world it was that which was, perhaps, dearest to the heart of Charlotte Brontë. She loved it even better than the storm-swept Haworth, where, with brief intervals, her own too short life was spent. There is nothing more beautiful in literary history than the strong affection which existed between Miss Brontë, and her two friends, Miss Ellen Nussey and Miss Mary Taylor. Commencing with their school life at Roehead, near Dewsbury, the friendship grew in strength with the lengthening years, and it was only dissolved by death. Both Miss Nussey and Miss Taylor belonged to Gomersal, and here Miss Brontë delighted to spend her holidays at the houses of the parents or relatives of her fellow pupils. What a pure source of pleasure these visits were to her may be gathered from her letters as well as from many a passage in her books.

At that period Gomersal occupied a position of splendid isolation. Cut off from railways, its only means of communication with the outside world was by the cumbersome and slow method of the stage coach, and electricity was then undreamt of in that region. But all these things have changed. There is now a branch line of the London and North-Western Railway by which Gomersal can be reached from Leeds in a comparatively few minutes, for the distance separating the two places is very short. It is, perhaps, only in accordance with tradition that there is no train on the Sunday. This, however, need not prevent the anxious traveller journeying to Gomersal on the Sabbath. The current of electricity has trickled into the district, so that if the intending passenger happen to be staying at Leeds he can, even on the Sunday, reach Gomersal by the electric trams, the only drawback being that he must first go to Bradford, a rather roundabout way of attaining his end. These electric trams run along the main thoroughfare of Gomersal, which has now direct communication with Bradford, Leeds, Batley, Heckmondwike, Birstal, Dewsbury, and other centres of industry,

Still, with all these improvements, Gomersal is little changed from the days when Charlottte Brontë knew it. Its buildings

remain the same, there have been few additions to the number of its houses, and the mode of speech is that which, though it was like music to the ears of Miss Brontë, was so terribly repellant and perplexing to her friend and biographer, Mrs. Gaskell, as to induce her to regard this part of the West Riding as scarcely better than the uncivilised wilds of Africa, and its people but one degree removed from the status of savages.

Notwithstanding its close proximity to great manufacturing towns, Gomersal retains much of the charm of sylvan simplicity which made it such a favourite with Charlotte Brontë. One can enter broad avenues of overhanging trees which in summer form a cool and pleasant shelter from the heat of the noontide sun. There are charming valleys intersected by running streams; there are bits of woodland dotted on the hillsides; there are well-kept meadows traversing hill and dale, and there is that diversity of scenery which, but for the occasional intrusion in the distance of a tall chimney betokening the vicinity of a mill, would lead to the belief that one was in the centre of the lake district or in some spot equally picturesque. The process of manufacture, it is true, has somewhat stunted the growth of the trees and militated against vegetation; but yet, despite this drawback, there is a wildness, a grandeur, and a ruggedness of contour about this district which appeal not only to the poet and painter, but to all real lovers of nature. Standing on Hill Top at Gomersal, one has a view which it would be difficult to surpass. As far as the eye can reach there is a blending of all that is most delightful in contrast, valley and hill alternating and stretching away, while in the far distance the stern Pennine Range crosses the horizon until its towering peaks are lost in mist and cloud.

Gomersal (including Birstal, which adjoins it) is the very heart of the district with which *Shirley* is concerned. With the book in his hand the Brontë enthusiast can go from one scene of the novel to another, and he will be gratified to find that the descriptions are as true to-day as they were at the time they were written. *Shirley* was Charlotte Brontë's first attempt to deal in a fictional form with the events of history, so far as they related to a particular neighbourhood, and a reference to the newspaper files of the time will show how accurately she handled her facts, even though treating them as subservient to her story. It is objected to *Shirley* that the plot is too slight; but be this as it may, there is no lack of incident in the book, while the descriptive portions are always striking. The narrative is woven round the successful efforts of a local manufacturer, Robert Gerard Moore, to meet increasing competition by adopting new methods in his mill; and it is the opposition he encountered in introducing machinery to do that which had hitherto been done by manual labour, that led to the rise of his

workmen and to the conflict which necessitated the calling in of the military and the shedding of blood. The master, who was well-meaning, and clearly had right and justice on his side, was, in the end, the victor; and in time, his own employeés, as well as the other manufacturers of the district, who had at first been inclined to look askance at his course of conduct and gravely to question his means of accomplishing his purpose, recognised the integrity of his aims and the manly honesty by which he attained them.

The other principal characters who figure in this work are Shirley Keeldar, the heroine; her friend, Caroline Helstone, the niece of the rector of Briarfield; the Rev. Matthewson Helstone, the rector in question, and Hiram Yorke. All these persons were identified the moment that the book was read by the residents of the stretch of country surrounding Gomersal. There could be no mistake. Briarfield, the scene of the novel, is Gomersal (and under this name was included Birstal, the two parishes being treated throughout as one). Fieldhead, the residence of Shirley, is Oakwell Hall, an old-fashioned building between Gomersal and Birstal, which exists to this day in appearance exactly as it was when Charlotte Brontë depicted it. Briarmains, the dwelling of Hiram Yorke, known locally as the Red House, may be still seen standing close to the high road at Gomersal, and one can now alight from the electric tram at its very gate. Hollows Mill, where the riot of the workmen took place, is a factory at Hunsworth, a mile or two from Gomersal, which was worked by the Yorkes, the cottage adjoining being always occupied by a member of the family, and here Charlotte Brontë stayed many a time on her visits to her friends. Briarfield Church in the story is Birstal Church, which, unlike all the other places, has been altered and improved very materially since it was described by Miss Brontë; but the Vicarage, where she located Caroline Helstone and her uncle, across the road a short distance from the church itself, remains the same. Other spots are equally easy of identification.

Of the minor characters in *Shirley* the three curates, the Rev. Joseph Donne, the Rev. Peter Augustus Malone and the Rev. David Sweeting, play the most prominent part. The first of these, Mr. Donne, was the curate of Whinbury (Dewsbury). In real life he was the Rev. Joseph Brett Grant, B.A., who, in 1844 was head-master of Haworth Grammar School, being appointed in the following year incumbent, and afterwards vicar of Oxenhope, where he died more than a quarter of a century later. Mr. Malone, the curate of Briarfield (Gomersal), was a sketch of the Rev. James William Smith, a native of Ireland, whose love of convivialty at one period threatened to involve Charlotte Brontë's father in a similar liking for strong liquors. From 1842 to 1844 Mr. Smith was curate to Mr. Brontë at Haworth, and in 1844 he was appointed to the curacy of the neighbouring town of Keighley, where he remained

until 1846. He then returned to Ireland, whence after a brief stay he set out for Canada. According to one story the vessel in which he sailed was lost with all hands, but another account states that he arrived in Canada, and was last heard of in Minnesota. The Rev. David Sweeting was intended for the Rev. James Chesterton Bradley, curate of Oakworth, near Keighley, to which he was appointed in 1845. He had graduated at Oxford in 1843. A long illness, which threatened to terminate fatally, induced Mr. Bradley to resign his Yorkshire charge, and it was not till considerably later that he was able to resume his clerical duties. In 1847 he became curate of All Saints', Paddington, remaining here till 1855. In 1856 he went as curate to Corfe Castle, Dorsetshire, where he laboured for several years, and in 1863 he became rector of Sutton-under-Brails, Warwickshire, retiring in 1904, owing to his advancing years. Nothwithstanding his great age, it is pleasing to note that Mr. Bradley is still fairly active, and that he lives at Richmond, in Surrey.

To two of the curates—Donne and Malone—Miss Brontë showed but scant courtesy. They are drawn with scarce a redeeming feature; they have all the faults and none of the virtues of their class. Ignorant and arrogant, ill-bred and ill-mannered, they are the very antithesis of the country curates as we know them. The picture was, no doubt, painted in exaggerated colours, the authoress at the time relying probably on her pen name to shield her from discovery and on the disguise in those of her victims to hide them from the too curious. But there were certain traits in their characters which could not be mistaken, and the secret was soon out. We have, however, the testimony of the Rev. Mr. Bradley himself to the high esteem in which his two clerical friends were held, and to the conscientious manner in which they discharged their duties. That they could not have been very lacking in Christian forbearance is proved by Miss Brontë herself, for after the first momentary shock consequent upon finding themselves delineated as such brutes, they quietly accepted the situation, and showed so little ill-feeling that they were actually in the habit of calling themselves by the names in which they are ticketed in the book.

Writing to her publishers, and referring to an adverse criticism that had appeared in one of the newspapers, Miss Brontë says:

"I think it has had very little weight up here in the north. It may be that annoying remarks, if made, are not intended to reach my ears; but certainly, while I have heard little condemnatory of *Shirley*, more than once have I been deeply moved by manifestations of even enthusiastic approbation. I deem it unwise to dwell much on these matters; but for once I must permit myself to remark that the generous pride many of the Yorkshire people have taken in the matter has been such as to awake and claim my gratitude—especially since it has afforded a source of reviving pleasure to my father in his old age. The very curates, poor

fellows, show no resentment; each, characteristically, finds solace for his own wounds in crowing over his brethren. Mr. Donne was, at first, a little disturbed; for a week or two he was in disquietude, but he is now soothed down; only yesterday I had the pleasure of making him a comfortable cup of tea, and seeing him sip it with revived complacency. It is a curious fact that since he read *Shirley* he has come to the house oftener than ever, and been remarkably meek and assiduous to please. Some people's natures are veritable enigmas; I quite expected to have had one good scene at least with him, but as yet nothing of the sort has occurred."

But the curates were not all painted in lurid colours. The Rev. David Sweeting, for instance, was shown to be a young cleric full of enthusiasm for his vocation, courteous and obliging, and never sparing of himself in his efforts to promote the happiness of those among whom he laboured. And, again, toward the very end of the book another curate is introduced, also an Irishman, the desire of the writer evidently being to dispel somewhat of the idea that curates from the sister country—from which her own father hailed—were more given to dissipation than their English *confrères*. There had come to succeed Mr. Malone in the curacy of Briarfield the Rev. Mr. Macarthey, and this is how he is spoken of in the novel:

"I am happy to be able to inform you, with truth, that this gentleman did as much credit to his country as Malone had done it discredit; he proved himself decent, decorous, and conscientious, as Peter was rampant, boisterous, and—— (this last epithet I choose to suppress, because it would let the cat out of the bag). He laboured faithfully in the parish; the schools, both Sunday and day schools, flourished under his sway like green bay-trees. Being human, of course he had his faults; these, however, were proper, steady-going clerical faults, what many would call virtues; the circumstance of finding himself invited to tea with a Dissenter would unhinge him for a week; the spectacle of a Quaker wearing his hat in the church, the thought of an unbaptised fellow-creature being interred with Christian rites—these things would make strange havoc in Mr. Macarthey's physical and mental economy; otherwise he was sane and rational, diligent and charitable."

The Mr. Macarthey here referred to was the Rev. A. B. Nichols, who came to Haworth as Mr. Brontë's curate. He fell in love with the gifted authoress, and after a time she came to regard him with equal affection. Mr. Brontë for long opposed the match, but ultimately was as anxious for it as the lovers themselves. The marriage accordingly took place, but, alas! the union was of short duration. Nine months after, Charlotte Brontë was laid to rest in the family grave at Haworth. It is a singular commentary on the situation that although Mr. Brontë's objection to the marriage was the precarious health of his then curate, the Rev. Mr. Nichols still survives, living in his own native country.

Some of the most brilliant chapters in the novel are those in which the curates figure. Take, for instance, the one headed "Mr. Donne's Exodus." Mr. Donne and Mr. Malone pay a visit to

Fieldhead, for, as Shirley observes, these clerical gentlemen always hunt in couples. At the outset we are treated to a bit of light comedy. Shirley has a faithful dog, Tartar, who offends Mr. Donne by barking on the arrival of the strangers within the gates. "Down, sir!" cries the rev. gentleman, at the same time administering a blow to the animal. This is more than Tartar, unaccustomed to such attentions, can stand, and he at once turns upon his assailant. There is a rush for the staircase leading from the hall, and it is a race between the valorous curates as to who shall first reach a place of safety. Mr. Donne is the quicker of the two, and obtaining the sanctuary of a bedroom, unmindful of the fate of his companion, he hurriedly closes and locks the door. Meanwhile, Mr. Malone, having gained the door, pulls frantically at the handle, vainly entreating the occupant to admit him also. The entry of Shirley puts an end to a ludicrous situation. She calms Tartar, soothes the fears of Mr. Malone, and, later, induces the gallant Mr. Donne to quit the refuge of his fortress. With true Hibernian readiness, Mr. Malone has a prompt excuse for his undignified retreat. "Really, that animal alarmed Donne. He is a little timid. . . . I thought it better to follow him to reassure him."

From comedy we pass to a more tragic vein. The company has been augmented by the addition of Mr. Sweeting and his vicar, Mr. Hall—a delightful man, beloved of all his parishioners, and esteemed by his Nonconformist neighbours. But the irrepressible Mr. Donne is again to cause a diversion. He explains that he has come on a begging mission, the object of his solicitations being a school in a distant parish of which Shirley has no knowledge, and in which, as she points out, she has no property. "That does not signify," says Mr. Donne, "for you're a Churchwoman, ain't you?" Thus he patters on, impervious to the sarcasm in Shirley's remarks, even when, after he has described the people of the parish as "a set of uncivilised brutes," he has been told that in him they would have a thoroughly sympathetic missionary. The climax is approaching. Shirley puts down her name for £5. Donne, without the slightest preface, characterises the sum as "shabby," and proceeds to inform the donor that in the South a lady with a similar income would be ashamed to give such a small amount. What follows is well worth quoting:

"Shirley, so rarely haughty, looked so now. Her slight frame became nerved; her distinguished face quickened with scorn.

"'Strange remarks,' said she; 'most inconsiderate. Reproach in return for bounty is misplaced.'

"'Bounty! Do you call five pounds bounty?'

"'I do; and bounty which, had I not given it to Dr. Boultby's intended school, of the erection of which I approve, and in no sort to his curate, who seems ill-advised in his manner of applying, or rather extorting, subscriptions—bounty, I repeat, which, but for this consideration, I should instantly reclaim.'

"Donne was thick-skinned; he did not feel all or half that the tone, air, glance of the speaker expressed; he knew not on what ground he stood.

"'Wretched place—this Yorkshire,' he went on. 'I could never have formed an idea of the country had I not seen it; and the people, rich and poor—what a set! How corse and uncultivated! They would be'scouted in the South.'

"Shirley leaned forward on the table, her nostrils dilating a little, her taper fingers interlaced and compressing each other hard.

"'The rich,' pursued the infatuated and unconscious Donne, 'are a parcel of misers, never living as persons with their incomes ought to live; you scarsley' (you must excuse Mr. Donne's pronunciation, reader, it was very choice. He considered it genteel, and prided himself on his southern accent; northern ears received with singular sensations his utterance of certain words) 'you scarsley ever see a fam'ly where a propa carriage or a reg'la butla is kep, and as to the poor—just look at them when they come crowding about the church doors on the occasion of a marriage or a funeral, clattering in clogs; the men in their shirt-sleeves and wool-combers' aprons, the women in mob-caps and bedgowns. They pos'tively deserve *that* one should turn a mad cow in amongst them to rout their rabble ranks. He! he! What fun it would be!'

"'There, you have reached the climax,' said Shirley quietly. 'You have reached the climax,' she repeated, turning her glowing glance towards him. 'You cannot go beyond it, and,' she added with emphasis, 'you shall not in my house.'

"Up she rose. Nobody could control her now, for she was exasperated; straight she walked to her garden gates; wide she flung them open.

"'Walk through,' she said austerely, 'and pretty quickly, and set foot on this pavement no more.'

"Donne was astounded. He had thought all the time he was showing himself off to high advantage, as a lofty person of the first 'ton'; he imagined he was producing a crushing impression. Had he not expressed disdain of everything in Yorkshire? And yet here was he about to be turned like a dog out of a Yorkshire garden! Where, under such circumstances, was the 'concatenation accordingly'?

"'Rid me of you instantly—instantly,' reiterated Shirley, as he lingered.

"'Madam, a clergyman! Turn out a clergyman?'

"Off! Were you an archbishop, you have proved yourself no gentleman, and you must go. Quick.'

"She was quite resolved; there was no trifling with her; besides, Tartar was again rising; he perceived symptoms of emotion; he manifested a disposition to join in; there was evidently nothing for it but to go, and Donne made his exodus, the heiress sweeping him a deep curtsey as she closed the gates on him.

"'How dare the pompous priest abuse his flock? How dare the lisping Cockney revile Yorkshire?' was her sole observation on the circumstance as she returned to the table.

"Ere long the little party broke up. Miss Keeldar's ruffled and darkened brow, curled lip, and incensed eye gave no invitation to further social enjoyment."

Turning again to the principals in the novel, Robert Gerard Moore was Mr. William Cartwright, of Rawfolds Mill, Liversedge, a village lying contiguous to Gomersal. The riot really took place at Rawfolds, though Miss Brontë has transferred the scene to Hunsworth, with which she was much better acquainted.

The Rev. Matthewson Helstone, who was accompanied by his curate, Malone, assisted Mr. Moore on the occasion of the night attack on the mill by the rioters. Mr. Helstone was drawn from the Rev. Hammond Roberson, of Liversedge, a native of Cawston, Norfolk, who, after leaving Cambridge University, was appointed, in 1779, to a curacy at Dewsbury. This position he resigned a year later, and opening a school at Dewsbury Moor began a most useful and successful career as a teacher. In 1795 he purchased Healds Hall, Liversedge, which was his abode to the end of his life. In the same year he was presented to the living of Hartshead-cum-Clifton. At Healds Hall, the largest house in Liversedge, he continued to conduct a boys' school, and such a reputation did he acquire for sound and practical teaching that he earned a very large income from this source. He did not, however, hoard up his money. Entirely at his own expense he built Christ Church, Liversedge, at a cost of £7474, and he became its first incumbent. It was also mainly through his efforts that churches were erected in the neighbouring parishes of Cleckheaton and Birkenshaw. Of stern, old high Tory principles, it was but natural that in days when party feeling was so strong, he should have been regarded with something of disfavour by the red-hot Radicals of the district. He was a man of unconquerable courage, self-sacrificing and generous to a degree, of a tenacity of purpose which scarcely anything could move, when once he had mapped out a course which he thought was right. To the poor he was kind and benevolent, and differences of politics or religion were quite obliterated from his mind whenever a question of distress arose. He died at Liversedge in 1841, aged eighty-four years, and by his own express directions was buried in a simple grave in Liversedge churchyard, the inscription on the plain little headstone reading: "The Rev. Hammond Roberson. Founder of this church in 1816. Died August 9, 1841, aged 84."

The late Mr. Frank Peel, in his *Spen Valley: Past and Present*, gives a full account of the riot at Rawfolds, and an excellent sketch of Mr. Roberson. He mentions that a local oddity named Richard Kitchen, but who was better known as Dick Dawber—no doubt a polite way of indicating his profession—was employed by Mr. Roberson to do the plastering in connection with the new church at Liversedge. Looking in one day to see how the work progressed, he heard a lusty voice trolling the chorus:

"She is young, and she is beautiful,
The fairest girl I know;
The only girl that 'tices me
Is Irish Molly O!"

The singer was Dick, who was keeping time by vigorously plying his trowel in manipulating the plaster. "Richard, Richard," called out Mr. Roberson, "do you know where you are? Such profane

trash as that should not be sung in a church." Richard was profuse in his apologies, and humbly inquired what selection would be properly applicable to the nature of the edifice, as work he could not unless he was allowed to sing at the same time. "Oh, if you must sing," was the reply, "let it be the 'Old Hundred.'" Mr. Roberson then left, but returning a little afterwards, he found Dick droning out the "Old Hundred" in the slowest of measure, and as his trowel only kept pace with the speed of the music, the plastering was making correspondingly slow progress. "Dick, Dick, this will never do," bawled out the pastor. "Strike up 'Irish Molly' again." Nothing loth Dick complied with the welcome request, and any cause of complaint as to the rate of the trowelling was removed.

Another anecdote for which we are indebted to Mr. Peel, has reference to the proceedings at Rawfolds. Mr. Roberson was called upon to attend to two workers who had taken part in the onslaught, in which they had received fatal injuries. The reverend gentleman was most anxious that the men should confess who had been their accomplices. One of them died without uttering a word on the subject. As the other lay at the point of death, he beckoned Mr. Roberson, who hastened to his side in the full expectation that he was about to learn the fateful tidings. This belief was strengthened by the first words of the sufferer. "Can you keep a secret?" he gasped. "I can," was the eager response of the clergyman. "So can I," said the dying man, and immediately afterwards he calmly passed away.

Perhaps the most interesting figure in the book is that of Hiram Yorke, which is acknowledged to be a faithful portrait of Mr. Joshua Taylor, a cloth manufacturer and banker, residing at Red House, Gomersal, whose mill was at Hunsworth. A man of excellent education and of wide reading, Mr. Yorke had travelled much on the Continent, had lived in France, and spoke its language with all the fluency and ease of a native. A Radical of the most unbending type, frank to the verge of brutality, intolerant of abuses, and a hater of shams, he was somewhat feared by the rich, but absolutely loved by the poor. His sarcasm—always keen and pointed—was as cutting as the lash of a whip, and to supersensitive minds often left a rankling sore behind. He was eminently just in all his dealings, considerate in the treatment of his workpeople, and, though he himself neither courted fame nor cared for the opinion of any one, was yet the most popular man in the district with the rank and file. Between him and Mr. Roberson there was the strongest antagonism expressed in many a wordy conflict in which, though on different lines, the combatants were pretty evenly matched. The superior vein of irony, however, in Mr. Yorke's temperament often left him the victor over the parson.

It would have surprised southerners to have heard Mr. Yorke, unaccustomed as they are to this type of character. He could adapt himself to any company. Place him amongst the most learned and he could carry on the conversation in the purest of English, informed by his extensive knowledge, his ripe experience of men and affairs, and his familiarity with the usages and customs of foreign countries acquired by his residence in strange lands. Pass without pause into another room, occupied, say, by Yorkshiremen of the artisan class, Mr. Yorke would converse with them in their own language, that rich broad Doric, which so greatly troubles the stranger, without a pause, or suspicion in his tones that this was not his only mode of speech. "A Yorkshire burr," he affirmed, "was as much better than a Cockney's lisp, as a bull's bellow than a ratton's squeak."

At this very moment there are many Yorkshire manufacturers who possess the same bi-lingual qualification. Is not Haworth itself in the wapentake of Morley, a pushing little woollen borough some three miles from Gomersal? Morley has the distinction of being the birthplace of our present Chancellor of the Exchequer, and if Mr. Asquith has kept up his intimacy with the town of his nativity, as no doubt he has, he could easily point to half a dozen prominent mill-owners, who while able to hold their own conversationally with the best wits of a London drawing-room, could, at the same time, step into an adjoining apartment and, with equal facility, join in a discussion conducted in the dialect rarely heard outside their own West Riding.

Hiram Yorke was the champion of the oppressed and the espouser of struggling causes. There is in the main street at Gomersal at this very day a building which he gave to a poor sect when they had no place in which to worship. It is supposed to be the Wesleyan chapel where the remarkable service and the impassioned singing referred to in *Shirley* took place, but it has since been diverted from its original purpose, whatever that was, and is now used as a carpenter's shop. The Yorkes, or to give them their real name, the Taylors, were for generations one of the leading families of Gomersal. The Red House ("Briarmains") was built so far back as 1660, and was continuously occupied by a representative of the Taylors for nearly two centuries. At the time that Charlotte Brontë made their acquaintance, the period of their prosperity had set. Mr. Joshua Taylor becoming involved in heavy financial loss, the family were scattered, and the old house eventually passed out of their possession. It speaks well for the integrity of the sons that, labouring far apart, they never lost sight of one object, that of preserving untarnished the high name they had always borne for their straightforward dealing, and that they paid to the uttermost farthing the liabilities incurred

by their father. Readers of *Shirley* will learn with delight that once more the old house has reverted to the possession of the old family, and is again occupied by a bearer of the honoured name.

The Taylors carried their independence to the point of eccentricity. They chose to be buried, not in the ordinary place of sepulchre, but in a spot on their own estate. A little way from the main road at Gomersal, on the side of a wooded glen which formed part of their property, is a small burial ground in which rest "Hiram Yorke" and some other members of the Taylor family. This strange cemetery in miniature is railed off from the remainder of the copse in which it is situate, but it is possible to discern the tombs from a neighbouring field, each having its own separate headstone.

It was at Red House that Miss Brontë visited her two schoolmates, Rose and Jessie Yorke, of *Shirley* the elder being Mary and the younger Martha Taylor, the daughters of Joshua Taylor. Martha died quite young, in 1842, while she was at school with Mary a short distance outside Brussels.

"She lived through an April day; much loved was she, much loving. She often, in her brief life, shed tears; she had frequent sorrows; she smiled between, gladdening whatever saw her. Her death was tranquil and happy in Rose's guardian arms, for Rose had been her stay and defender through many trials; the dying and the watching English girls were at that hour alone in a foreign country, and the soil of that country gave Jessie a grave."

Mary Taylor survived to a ripe old age. Soon after leaving Brussels, and when her father's affairs rendered it impossible for them to live as they had hitherto done, Mary, with that spirit of independence which was part of the heritage of the family, decided that she would "fend" for herself, as they say in Yorkshire, that is, that she would try and earn her own livelihood. There was no necessity for such a drastic course as this, suggested Miss Brontë in a letter to Miss Nussey, who had hinted that Miss Taylor had views of emigrating to New Zealand, where openings were thought to be more numerous and the chances brighter for the moment than they were in the old country. But Miss Taylor could not bear the idea of being a burden to any one, and, besides, she had the ambition to do whatever she could to restore the broken fortunes of her house. Accordingly she went with a brother to New Zealand, where she embarked in the business of a store, and her native shrewdness, her keen capacity for business, and, be it said, her indefatigable industry, enabled her to amass sufficient capital to permit of her return, many years later, to Gomersal. Here she built herself a comfortable residence, High Royd, within convenient reach of her old home, among old friends, whose love

for the family never diminished, just on the dip of the hill leading to the quaint burial-ground where several of her relatives had been laid in their last resting place. She died so recently as 1893, and is buried in Gomersal Churchyard. A lifelong friend and admirer of Charlotte Brontë, she has borne eloquent testimony to the truth of the novelist's sketches of Yorkshire characters. She was all the more qualified to do this seeing that she was herself an authoress, with a pen of rare power, though a dislike of notoriety stood in the way of her cultivating this precious gift.

Only two more of the principal characters of *Shirley* remain. Of these, the one that gives the title to the novel was intended as a representative of what Emily Brontë would have become had life been spared to her and health and wealth been her portion. Shirley had all Emily's love of the moors and her fondness for animals. The incident appertaining to the concealment by Shirley of the fact that she had been bitten by a dog supposed to have been mad, and in which, disregarding all pain, she herself cauterised the wound with an ordinary iron used for starching domestic linen, is taken direct from life, for this is exactly what Emily Brontë did, when she had been bitten by one of the dogs at Haworth.

Speaking of Caroline Helstone, Mrs. Humphry Ward ventures the opinion that for delicacy, poetry, divination, charm, Caroline stands supreme among the women of Miss Brontë's gallery. The question arises, who is intended to be represented here? The general impression is that, under this name, Miss Brontë has given a portrait of Miss Nussey. To the very last Miss Nussey firmly believed this, and there is no shadow of doubt that many of the traits in Caroline had been copied by Miss Brontë from her friend. And never was there a more beautiful friendship. Commencing, as it has been pointed out, with their school-days, it was sundered only by death; and after Charlotte Brontë had been laid in the tomb, Miss Nussey, jealous of her fame, guarded her literary reputation from the assaults of ignorance or misconception with all the ardour of the mother protecting her offspring.

Miss Nussey was born at Gomersal in 1817, and except for the few years she spent at school, practically passed all her life in the village, every stone of which she knew. It was on visits to her and the Taylors that Charlotte Brontë, with her quick powers of observation, assimilated that store of local knowledge which was subsequently to surprise even her friends with its truth of detail and accuracy of treatment. In those early days Miss Nussey's family resided at a house called the Rydings, but in later years she lived at Brookroyd, and latterly at Moor Lane House. Miss Nussey, too, was gifted with the literary faculty, and those of her letters which have seen the light of publication are charming in their style and

diction, and for almost all we know of Miss Brontë we are indebted to Miss Nussey. Every letter that she received from the friend at Haworth she preserved with religious care, and it is to this fact that we owe one of the most interesting of literary biographies. It was only at the earnest solicitation of Miss Nussey that the Rev. Patrick Brontë and his son-in-law consented to the preparation of the life of Charlotte Brontë, which was subsequently written by Mrs. Gaskell.

Miss Nussey, who died on November 26, 1897, at the age of eighty, is buried in the churchyard at Birstal ("Briarfield"). She is well remembered at Gomersal, of which she was one of the most respected inhabitants. For very many years she was a constant visitor to the house of Mr. J. Robinson, Willow Cottage, West Lane, the mother-in-law of Mr. Robinson—who, by the way, was born, lived all her life there, and died in Willow Cottage—being one of her particular friends. Here there were many conversations about Charlotte Brontë, and in one of the rooms at the present time there is a chair which it is said the distinguished novelist herself was wont to occupy in former days.

ERNEST HOBSON.

MADAME DE STAAL-DELAUNAY.

THE widespread interest manifested of late in the story of Mdlle. de Lespinasse is my apology for writing a short article upon another friend of Mme. du Deffand, quite as brilliant, though perhaps lacking that passion and tragic intensity, which bids fair to render Julie immortal. The success of Marguerite Jeanne Cordier Delaunay is all the more remarkable when one learns that she possessed neither birth, fortune, nor beauty; and that, although endowed with all the gifts and graces which made a *salonière*, she lacked the essential *pied-à-terre*. For the greater part of her life she was not only homeless, but a dependant, yet in the historical drama of her time she played so prominent a part, that the charm of her personality is reflected in contemporary literature with its fascinating presentments of the many-sided life of the society in which she moved.

She was the daughter of one of those painters of minor rank employed for the most part in decorating the furniture and ceilings of the great *châteaux*, and her birth is stated to have occurred at Paris, at various dates between 1684 and 1693. Her mother was in straightened circumstances and thankfully accepted asylum in the Convent of Sauveur d'Evreux in Normandy, procured through the influence of the Mesdames de Grieu, nuns of another convent, but latterly living in Saint Sauveur. These ladies in the course of time lost their hearts to little Marguerite, whose quaint sayings at the age of two gave some promise of her future brilliancy. The abbess, a sister of the Duc de la Rochefoucauld, and almost as clever as the author of *Maxims*, had a mania for housing invalid dogs in her apartments. Once the child trod on one, and the abbess seemed so distressed, that some of the company whispered to her to ask for pardon. Misunderstanding the suggestion, she knelt in front of the dog and offered him so pretty an apology that every one was charmed, and from that day she became the pet of the convent.

The noble ladies devoted themselves to her instruction. Instead of putting her asleep with the *Peau d'ane*, they grounded her in sacred and profane history; and when they went to the Priory of Saint Louis at Rouen, of which the elder had been appointed abbess, they took Marguerite with them. Having taught her all they could themselves, they provided the instruction of the best

masters. Indeed it would seem that the only advantage she did not enjoy was discipline, for she said once, "quvique infiniment petite j'avais acquis tous les défants des grands." That these faults did not develop into vices may be due to the fact that she was very *dévote*. She spent her leisure in reading the *Lives of the Saints*, and once, when in her early teens, in order to have more time for her devotions by abridging her toilet, she had her long and beautiful hair cropped quite short.

When Marguerite was about fifteen, a new influence entered her life. Mdlle. de Silly, the daughter of the Marquis de Silly, came to stay in the convent. She was some years her senior, cultured and well read, and introduced her to the study of philosophy, just then affected by fine ladies in France. They had abandoned novels, the tambour-frame and the care of their houses, "où l'on voyait aller tout sens dessus, dessous," to read, and discuss after a fashion, Descartes, de Gassendi, and Pascal. They felt or feigned the same enthusiasm for abstract ideas, as the æsthetes of a later day professed for the sun-flower. *Les Femmes Savantes, Les Précieuse Ridicules,*" gave these absurd pretensions their *quietus* as effectively as *Patience*, and the *Colonel*, crushed the late Victorian æsthetic craze. Marguerite read Descartes under Mdlle. de Silly's guidance, and *La Recherche de la Vérité* inspired a love for philosophic speculation. But she was saved from becoming an *Armande*, or a Bélise, partly by a strong sense of humour, and partly, because feeling that such researches if pursued too far, might undermine her faith, she discontinued them.

The illustrious *savant* Brunel was introduced to her by Mdlle. de Silly, and was amazed to find a convent-bred girl who had, not only studied Descartes and the systems of Malebranche, but could discuss their works with penetration and understanding. He, however, lacked the graces acquired only in the great world, and, possibly for that reason, the girl, brought up so much above her own station, felt nothing for him but a platonic friendship.

The dangerous illness of her abbess, and the possibility of a fatal termination, caused Marguerite no little anxiety as to her future prospects. She had no means, and had no expectations from the abbess, or indeed any one. A lady, knowing her circumstances, offered to dower her for the convent, and although unwilling to receive so great a favour from a stranger, she felt she had no alternative, and was on the point of accepting. At this juncture she made confidantes of the Mdlles. D'Epiney, who lived with their uncle M. de Rey. The latter had taken notice of his nieces' friend, and on learning that she contemplated "narrowing nunnery walls," he resolved to dissuade her from such a course. He frankly intimated that he was not free to marry her, but begged permission to make provision for her in *tout bien tout*

honneur, promising that if she would accept his offer, he would never see her more, should she so desire. But she refused it, and also a proposal by the Abbé Vertot, to invest in her name a sum of money sufficient for her maintenance. Fortunately the Abbess recovered, and Marguerite's happy life in the convent continued for some years longer.

The great events of this period were her visits to her friend, Mdlle. de Silly, at the Château de Silly in Lower Normandy. The château was a great change, although life there was as quiet as at the convent. The old Marquis hated expense, and the Marquise, who was very religious, avoided company. Of the few men she met there only the Chevalier d'Herb made any impression. He arrived one evening and played hombre, and though she could not recall anything he said beyond "gano," "trois matadors," or "sans prendre," he seemed not unattractive. He came often afterwards, and she and Mdlle. de Silly wondered which of them was the magnet. They affected to treat the affair as a joke, but Marguerite felt not a little piqued when he proposed marriage later on to her friend.

During the first visit she heard much of the young Marquis. He had been taken prisoner at Hochstet and deported to England, where the climate was said to have given him consumption. For that reason he had been permitted to return to France on parole. The Parisian physicians advised him to try his native air for a change, and at the termination of her visit the Marquise had made Marguerite promise to return when her son should be there, hoping that the girl, whom all found so charming, would amuse him.

On her return to the convent Marguerite received the warmest welcome, M. de Rey alone seeming cooler. His custom had been to escort her to the convent when returning from visiting his nieces. The way lay through a large place, and formerly, in order to prolong the walk, he had always taken her along two sides. Now, however, he proceeded directly across, from which she concluded that his attachment had grown less by the difference between the diagonal and the two sides of the square.

She soon revisited Silly, but was mortified to discover that the young Marquis affected a Byronic gloom, and contempt for society generally. But before long her company roused and interested him, and she fell deeply in love. Unfortunately he never felt, nor professed to feel, anything beyond a generous and admiring friendship for her. He appears to have been her first great passion. Henceforward love played a prominent part in her life, and she was not diffident in discussing her numerous admirers. Asked once how, when writing her *Memoirs*, she intended to deal with her love affairs, she replied, "Je me peindrai en buste."

Life at the Convent of Saint Louis was rather tame after her

experiences at Silly, whither she had hoped to be again invited. The old Marquis, however, died, and no invitation was forthcoming. An invitation to stay with a friend, Mdlle. de la Ferté, at the Château de Roeux, however, promised some compensations, and she accepted it all the more readily, because of its proximity to Silly. The first portion of the journey was made on the Seine, and their barge was followed by another filled with musicians, who played various wind and stringed instruments. The next evening they reached their destination, the ancient château, which like many old Norman castles, was built in the form of a Gothic "R," representing the initial letter of its name, and was surrounded by pleasaunces where fountains played night and day.

Shortly after Mdlle. Delaunay had returned to the convent her abbess and friend died, and the abbaye was given to the care of another nun, and not to Mme. de Grieu. The latter proceeded to the Convent of La Présentation in Paris with her protegée, who had only enough money to pay one quarter's *pension*, and who fell ill when she had disbursed her last *louis*. Indeed, so seriously ill was she, that she prayed for death, but he tarried, and she recovered.

A sister of hers occupied some inferior position in the house of the Duchesse de la Ferté, no connection, however, of the friend of that name already referred to. She often spoke of her clever sister to her mistress, who at length sent for the object of her dependant's encomiums. They had exchanged but a few words, when the Duchess exclaimed, "*Elle parle à ravir.*" At first she was surprised that the girl could not cast a horoscope, and knew nothing of the occult sciences professed for a noble *clientèle* by the keiros of that day; but she soon got over her disappointment, and praised Mdlle. Delaunay's accomplishments to all her friends. "Here," she said, when introducing her to the Duchesse de Noailles, "is the girl I told you was so witty and clever. You must hear her talk." Turning to her she said, "Come, mademoiselle, talk!" and seeing her hesitate, she added encouragingly, "talk about religion; you shall talk of other things later!"

Amongst other high-born French dames she was introduced to the Duchess du Maine, and taken by her to Sceaux. Her hostess took little notice of her at first, and this so piqued the Duchess de la Ferté that she induced Malézieu to meet her. Malézieu had been tutor to the Duc de Maine, and was a perfect model of those *beaux esprits* with whom the *grands seigneurs* of that day had replaced the Wambas of an earlier century. He was a perfect fountain of knowledge, and at Sceaux was looked upon as an oracle. According to one of his biographers "his decisions had the same infallibility as those of Pythagoras, and the most heated argument was terminated when "*Il l'a dit*" was pronounced by one of the disputants. Malézieu was not slow to recognise her parts, and

having once pronounced in her favour, the Duchesse du Maine regarded her with more interest. At Sceaux she also met Baron, Molière's famous comedian, and Vertot, by whom she was introduced to the celebrated anatomist, Duvernay. The latter was amazed on discovering that Mdlle. Delaunay had read his works, and remarked that she was the girl in France who knew the human body best—a *mot* upon which evil tongues were not slow to place an uncharitable construction. This *savant* introduced her to a côterie which included great courtiers like the Duc la Feuillétade and the Duc de Rohan, and men of letters such as Fontanelle and Valincourt. It is surprising to find that in such environment the little bourgeoise not only held her own, but became the life of that brilliant circle by a natural tone of *bonne compagnie.*

These charming friendships, however, brought no material advantage, and Mdlle. Delaunay at length was forced to become *femme de chambre* to the Duchesse du Maine. The Duchesse's father was the son of the great Condé, and the club-footed son of Louis XIV. and Mme. de Montespan had not seemed a desirable *parti* for the grand-daughter of *M. le Prince le héros,* even though legitimised and authorised to bear the name of Bourbon. But the disadvantages of the alliance were counterbalanced by the fact that he had inherited the vast fortune of la Grande Mademoiselle, who had made him her heir in order to purchase the freedom of the ungrateful Lauzan. The Duchesse du Maine is described by Mme. de Maintenon as "*jolie, aimable, et spirituelle.*" She was very small and dainty, with a child-like appearance that served later on as a cloak for her ambition. Her emblem, a *mouche à miel,* with its legend "*Piccolo si, ma fa pur grave le ferite,*" gives a fair clue to her disposition. She could not endure the etiquette of the Court, and retired to Sceaux, a lovely château in the valley of the Bièvre, surrounded by low wooded hills. But little more than a century and a half has passed since she died. As Arvède Barine suggests, our great-grandfathers might have recognised her, but to us she seems to have belonged to a different world, and the dukes and duchesses who danced ballets in the little theatre at Sceaux resemble rather characters in the *Arabian Nights* than historical entities. Here, with the assistance of Malézieu, Fontanelle, and even of Voltaire, she amused herself and her circle, living in an atmosphere of *petits jeux,* theatricals and forfeits; of bouts rimés, rondeaux, and riddles. Some of the latter discovered a pretty wit as, for instance, Fontanelle's answer to the conundrum "What is the difference between a clock and our hostess?" "One reminds you of the hours, and the other," he said, bowing to the Duchesse, "makes you forget them." Although a student of Descartes, she never allowed her studies to interfere with her amusements. For example, she worked as hard at amateur theatricals as any barn-stormer, and when one

learns that she played the part of *Célimène*, one cannot help wondering was it to Molière's *Alceste*.

In this fairy world Mdlle. Delaunay was at first but a spectator, and the incident which gave her a place in it was characteristic of the age, and shows what enormous value was placed on wit and graces of expression. A young and beautiful girl, Mdlle. Tétar, claimed to possess occult powers, and was consulted by all the *beau monde*, among others, by Fontanelle, on behalf of the Duc d'Orleans. He went to see her so often that tongues began to wag, and the Duchesse requested Mdlle. Delaunay to give him a hint to be more circumspect. The letter which she wrote was considered by all a miracle of composition, and became the talk of Paris, where it had been copied and handed about. At length the Duchesse perceived that she could use her maid to a better purpose than making her toilet.

The Duchesse du Maine suffered, as one can well believe, from insomnia, and it occurred to the Abbé Vaubrun to substitute an elaborate spectacle for card-playing. Accordingly a figure veiled as Night was made to appear and thank the Duchesse for the preference accorded her over Day. Mdlle. Delaunay represented Night, and recited a prologue. She was followed by a choir singing an ode in the same strain. Henceforth she played a leading part in the *Grandes Nuits de Sceaux*, instituted upon that occasion. Although the soul of these entertainments she was still in an equivocal position. She nevertheless had her own circle of admirers—wits and men of letters—who visited her in her little room before repairing to the *salon* of the Duchesse. Chaulieu, the "Anacreon of the Temple," was one of these, and probably Mdlle. Delaunay was his last love, for he had grown gouty and blind. A line of a poem he addressed to her is capable of a double meaning, viz.:

"Je vous adore, coquette, libertine, et friponne";

but, on the other hand, it must be remembered that she refused the jewellery he presented to her, naively advising him not to make the offer to many other women.

Irritated by the humiliations put upon her husband on the death of Louis, the Duchesse du Maine conceived the idea of overthrowing the Regent and placing the young King under the protection of the King of Spain. The famous *Mémoire des Princes Légitimés* was composed in her cabinet, and Mdlle. Delaunay acted as her secretary, introducing the perpetual stream of conspirators that flowed to Sceaux. She was, moreover, one of the principal agents for communicating with the Spanish Ambassador, Cellamare, from whom the plot derived its name. Indeed, so actively was she engaged that the authorities marked her as a dangerous person. At length they took vigorous action, and on December 19, 1718, a number of conspirators were

arrested, including the Duchesse and her secretary. The former was sent to the citadel of Dijon, but the latter was interned in the Bastille. That name conjures up lurid pictures of horror and suffering, but the two years spent there by Mdlle. Delaunay were full of rest and contentment. Nor were diversions denied her, for she had piquant flirtations with Maisonrouge, the King's lieutenant, and with her fellow-conspirator, the Chevalier de Ménil, subjected to two searching interrogatories by the Ministers Leblanc and d'Argenson, she manifested contemptuous fortitude. For example, when the former warned her that contumacious reticence would involve life-long imprisonment in the Bastile—"Eh bien," she replied, "c'est un établissment pour une fille comme moi qui n'a pas de bien."

Maisonrouge, a bluff upright soldier, hitherto proof against Cupid's darts, fell deeply in love with her, but his passion was unrequited. It was de Ménil who won her heart. It so happened that Maisonrouge first put them in communication with each other, and a poetical correspondence followed. Later on he introduced them personally, and the many interviews subsequently connived at form a charming prison idyll. Her coquetry at times excited de Ménil's jealousy. Once when he overheard her sing from her narrow window a scene from *Iphigénie*, and the Duc de Richelieu replying from his cell by rendering the part of *Orestes*, a quarrel was narrowly averted. De Ménil was released first, but his letters betrayed his waning affection. Maisonrouge, however, remained constant to the end. "*You are free*," he said, handing Mdlle. Delaunay the warrant for her release. "*I shall see you no more. What shall become of me?*"

The Duchesse de Maine, already at liberty, received her secretary so coldly that she was deeply hurt. De Ménil's infidelity also mortified her, and she often longed to be back in the Bastile. The Duchesse, however, proved not altogether ungrateful, and tried subsequently to arrange a marriage for Mdlle. Delaunay with one of the officers of the Swiss Guard. It was not easy to find a husband for a woman without birth, fortune, beauty, or youth. "*A peine les treize cantons pouvaient ils suffire à cette découverte.*" But at last the Baron de Staal, a widower with two daughters, living on a small property at Gennevilliers, proposed and was accepted. On her first visit to his château the place, the meal, the company, suggested to her the simplicity of the golden age. When she was leaving he laid at her feet a young lamb for her acceptance, which pastoral gallantry seemed to her charmingly in keeping with the other events of that really happy day. The Duc on her marriage gave her a pension, and her husband a company in the Swiss Guard, of which the Duc was *capitaine*, so that if she had not realised her ideal, she at least found herself in haven.

Mme. de Staal-Delaunay died at the age of fifty-six. In addition to her *Memoirs* she has left us two little plays, "*l'Engoûment*" and "*La Mode.*" In the latter the dialogue is fresh and sparkling, but otherwise they have little merit. We also have several volumes of her *Letters* to her numerous friends and admirers, which depict the taste and manners of the day with insight, but without bitterness, or the affected sensibility or pedantry then so much the fashion.

ELLEN WELSFORD MORROW.

WHY PRISONERS' WIVES ARE HELPED.

YOUNG or middle-aged men who offend against the law do not generally take into consideration that when they are detected, which is pretty sure to be the case, their wives and children will suffer dreadful penalties, such a malignant power has crime to inflict severest pain even on innocent persons. At the same time, suffering on behalf of a husband's fall, may cause a woman to develop into the heroine in a way which might have been thought impossible. In connection with the service carried on in connection with the discharged prisoners section of the St. Giles Christian Mission, numbers of such women come under the notice of Mr. Wheatley the superintendent, who, out of funds subscribed for the purpose, assists such women to tide over what may be in each instance the most distressing crisis of life. The trouble is such, in numbers of cases, as might break down even a strong man; but in many instances, weak women weather the storm, which might suddenly overwhelm them, in that surprising way which might seem to mark them out as the stronger rather than the weaker vessel in a moral sense. In addition, and not seldom, they may appear to come forth from the ordeal as gold tried in the fire. We suppose that to-day there are numbers of wives who are more than ever valued by their husbands, because in a time of severe privation they made every possible sacrifice to preserve their home and feed the children. It has also been proved by experience that men who have yielded to temptation to bring down on themselves the inevitable penalties, have been brought to a stand, as it were, by the heroic attitude of women in the hour of trial. Reproof of evil could hardly be stronger or more effective. Quite unknown to themselves generally, such wives succeed in administrating a corrective when a mere tirade or volume of words about the shortsightedness of crime would altogether fail, if it did not provoke a recriminative return. Large numbers of prisoners' wives, whose famishing children cling to them when supplies fail, are constantly being relieved by Mr. William Wheatley, in connection with the Discharged Prisoners' Aid Branch of the St. Giles Christian Mission. Prisoners in gaol, men who might have continued to be the respected bread-winners of their families, may well be wholesomely overwhelmed with

shame and repentance, when those for whom they still harbour affection, are ministered to by charity in their terrible privation. The more of the instinct of a true man which an offender has in him, the deeper is the lasting impression for good likely to be. Because his wife does not accuse him, the more bitterly will such a husband accuse himself. He could easily have given railing for railing; but a suffering, uncomplaining woman, who steps into the breach to repair damage done by wrong-doing, wins golden opinions from those who may have thought her to be incapable of rising above what *is* commonplace.

Of course, the prisoners' wives to whom we would draw attention in hope of their needs and deserts being more widely recognised, are not of one class. Indeed, those who speak or write of "the criminal class," "heredity," and so on, sometimes seem to be in some danger of losing their way, or of misapprehending the outlook. There are surroundings which naturally tend towards the fostering of crime; but the most expert or dangerous criminal may be neither more nor less than a renegade member of a respectable class. In everyday life wrong-doers come forth from all classes; were it otherwise, employers would wish to draw their assistants from the more favoured sections of the community.

Men who find their way into prison, and thus for the time leave their wives to struggle on as best they can, are for the most part such as have taken a false step while serving in situations. These assistants, however, are of different grades. Too often, indeed, a humble warehouseman is detected in giving way to the temptation to commit a petty theft. Young clerks, married or single, also show a large proportion of the offenders who come under Mr. Wheatley's notice; and the wives of such may be little more than mere girls, whose surroundings and education have been a grade or two higher than their neighbours of the working class. Then others of a higher grade become ensnared in pitfalls which they have prepared for themselves. A commercial traveller, or one in an equally responsible position, sometimes seems to be as liable to commit a criminal offence as an offender less important; and the wreck of a comfortable middle-class home is at least a peculiarly shocking disaster. The wife in such an environment, one whose youth and marriage were apparently invested with the glamour of romance, realises the degradation of a husband's fall with great intensity, the contrast being so great between present suffering and former days when she was happy and held in respect. It has also to be taken into account that a woman's sufferings, when her husband has serious crime brought home to him, are proportionate to the good character she has herself maintained. The better the woman, the greater is her trials when ruin overwhelms the home.

From time to time we have visited the genera loffices in Brooke Street, Holborn, occupied by Mr. Wheatley and his working staff, and have there taken notice of the cosmopolitan character of the continuous stream of applicants who seek assistance to tide over a crisis; or who wish to turn over a new leaf in life by sticking to honest work. It is possible to meet there a fallen clergyman in great mental anguish. On one occasion we had some talk with a man who had had considerable practice as a housebreaker, but who was willing to take to some creditable industry if assisted to do so. The more interesting characters in the throng, however, are the honest folk who come with a plea on behalf of dishonest relatives. How genuine is the confident tone of those distressed wives who have been brought into trouble by fallen husbands, or by a son who has given way to temptation, but who at least is judged of as a first offender. Unselfishness could not well show more telling examples than are seen in some of these women. When on such an errand, and with no other desire than to do the best possible for those who have possession of her heart, it never occurs to the woman to complain on her own account. To myself, as a London rambler, the very street whither these women come to make their sad complaints is a spot with tragic memories. The thoroughfare takes its name from Brooke House, which stood near, Lord Brooke being murdered in one of his own rooms in 1628. If was also in the attic of a sackmaker in this street that Chatterton, after destroying his papers, took arsenic and died. Then coming up to the back of Mr. Wheatley's working head-quarters is Fox Court, said to have been the birthplace of Richard Savage, an adventurer whom many now suppose to have been a shameless impostor.

From what may be seen and heard at Mr. Wheatley's office, one may come to the conclusion that prisoners' wives are very generally innocent sufferers whom it seems to be a duty to assist, while doing so has actually a strong tendency to discourage crime. Sad as the lot of a prisoner may be, it is held that he deserves his punishment; but, as Mr. Wheatley says, "The lot of his wife and children is a sadder one still, and it will be admitted that the sufferings they endure are undeserved and rigorous." He has also given this statement of the case:

"'Twelve months' hard labour,' says the judge, and the one to whom he speaks immediately disappears from the sight of the outside world. He goes to his imprisonment, and he is sheltered, clothed, and fed. The sentence on the man has very often indeed a further and more terrible meaning. His twelve months' imprisonment spells twelve months' misery, degradation, and starvation for his wife and children. So are the sins of the fathers visited upon the children, and so again, and yet again, the innocent suffer for the guilty; not only *for* the guilty, but *more than* the guilty. Of course it is easy to say that this is an over-statement of the

case, but it would be by no means easy to prove this criticism correct. The case *cannot* be overstated; or, if it can, we confess we are unable to find the needful words."

Some time ago, and speaking as the Chairman of the Westminster Sessions, Sir Ralph Littler emphatically stated that such aid, given to women suddenly plunged into distress by the dishonesty of their husbands, is not furthering a premium on felony, but is rather an insurance that felony shall not be committed.

When, after release from prison, a man who has fallen into a pitfall through crime, but is not of the criminal class, sits down to acknowledge kindness shown to his wife, he necessarily makes promise of amendment. He would be ashamed to regard himself as a man, in the conventional sense, if he did not at least make a brave endeavour to carry out such reformation. The ex-prisoner's style of address at the outset of what we may call his new lease of life, will, of course, be in keeping with his surroundings and Board-school education—*e.g.*, "Dear sir, I now take the liberty of writing to you to thank you for your great kindness to my wife in her time of need. Sir, I mean, by God's help, to begin a new life." Such expressions have the ring of honesty in them; and they not only reassure those who have it in their power to aid the man in regaining a good character; the wife herself is more cheered than any one else, for to her such words mean the dawn of a better day than she has yet known. Meanwhile, what does a brave woman think of the crisis when the severe strain and struggle become easier? Her heart overflows with gratitude, and she is convinced that God will reward those who have relieved her need. The supplies "which I never expected" were such as had not been seen or heard of before. Recent dark experience has caused her to think of earlier days, when, under the care of a fond mother, who is now an invalid, daily conduct was more safely guarded, life was happier and more fruitful in good. "I think this ought to teach my husband a lesson." A woman would naturally think so when privation, not of her own making, has taught *her* one—and one by which she hopes to profit to the end of her days.

The repentance of a penitent offender is oftentimes very genuine. He sees that if outside help had not been forthcoming, wife and family, humanly speaking, might have been lost to him; for when such catastrophes *do* happen in the too-little-understood province of houses we call London, what was there to prevent the household from dying of cold and want? "Had it not been for your kindness, I do not know what would have become of me and my family." Neither do we know what the *finale* might possibly have been had not Mr. Wheatley come on the scene when the crisis was in its most acute stage, to relieve the man's mind by sending in supplies to his wife and children.

In some instances a young man offender, with wife and family dependent on them, may not be prisoners in the strictest sense at all; they may be remanded to Brixton, or elsewhere, to await further examination. How expressive and suggestive, beyond the mere words written in it, will be the letter from his wife to such a man at such a time. "Dear Will, very sorry such a thing should have happened, but it is a very great strain on my shoulders." Because that is plainly seen, and because it is well known that the half-despairing woman is wondering how she shall manage to keep a home over the heads of herself and children, help will come from outside friends whose sympathy has already been given. The natural curiosity of the little ones in the home add distress to the situation. "The children do miss you, and keep asking where you are." How natural for little ones to ask such unwelcome questions.

How little did the woman who wrote thus think that her own plea for her husband's discharge would reach the magistrate who had the case in hand. Respecting this man, a note written by Mr. Wheatley to his worship, said:

> "I believe he is sorry for the past, and, from the conversation I had with his wife, if he be allowed out on Monday she has no doubt about the goodness of his future behaviour. I gave the poor woman £1 and clothes for herself and their seven children; she will be visited from time to time by our mission friends, and, by assisting them in their wants, I trust the man will be brought back to a better state of mind."

If no aid were available for the women and children who become destitute through a husband and father's fall and imprisonment, it looks as though, in many instances, their lives would actually be endangered. A visitor may testify, "They had no food, no fire." Or while one child may be found crying on account of cold, others have gone breakfastless to school. But for such dire privation to be known of at the Brooke Street office is for it to be promptly relieved. But then, the offending husband is to "be home next Thursday"; and what a contrast is that anticipation to the distress caused by his going away. But the man is not only coming home: he is coming back into an unsympathetic world with his temporal prospects blasted. It may possibly be found that the firm which the man sought to defraud, by some petty dishonest transaction, is of such irreproachable high standing that an assistant is never reinstated on the establishment after he has proved unworthy of the trust reposed in him. Hence, it turns out that after helping the wife, something must be done for the man. In the majority of instances this is a work of considerable difficulty, and the difficulty increases proportionately to the quality of the social standing which the man once occupied. For example, it is much easier to find work for an unskilled labourer than for a clerk who wears a black frock-coat and a tall silk hat. Such is the kindness and sympathy of certain

firms, however, that openings are commonly found for the fallen men who have to regain their standing; and the rule is, for a full revelation to be made of such men's antecedents. The best of all is, that such men do not generally disappoint the hopes of those who befriend them. A man must indeed have more of the devil in him than the majority of his comrades, if, for the second time, he dared, by a dishonest deed, to plunge wife and children into a slough of suffering and despair. What we may hopefully look for is, that the man has been providentially chastened by his trouble; and that the wife who has stood by him as a heroine all through is more to him than ever before, more of a help to himself, and a light in the home, than he ever supposed she could be. The things we have referred to are going on every day; and readers will see that the helping of prisoners' wives is not a mere outcome of sentimentality; it is work which tends to the lessening of crime.

G. Holden Pike.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.

IN the preface to the volume of essays entitled *Personal Idealism*, published about four years ago, the editor, Mr. Henry Sturt, stated that Personal Idealism was a development of the mode of thought which had dominated Oxford for the last thirty years; it was not a renunciation of it. But there was one essay in that volume which, as Mr. Sturt now says, "startled the world" by the adoption of a principle which has since become famous under the names of Pragmatism and Humanism. This was Mr. F. C. S. Schiller's essay, "Axioms as Postulates." This line of thought was further developed by Mr. Schiller about a year later in a volume of essays with the title "Humanism," and here we have a full and vigorous presentation of the system by Mr. Sturt in *Idola Theatri*.[1] This volume shows a considerable advance upon *Personal Idealism*, and actually amounts to a renunciation of the mode of thought which has dominated Oxford for a generation. Mr. J. H. Green, Mr. F. H. Bradley, and Prof. Bosanquet are subjected to the most ruthless criticism, and Absolute Idealism is thrown to the winds. We welcome the change, for one thing as Mr. Schiller said in *Humanism*, because the metaphysical theory of Absolute Idealism "simplifies nothing and complicates everything," and not less because to the non-professional reader of philosophy it appears to be all up in the air, having no substantial base in human experience. Humanism or Pragmatism, on the other hand, not only takes experience into account, but affirms the necessity of beginning with it; thus English philosophy is returning after a long period of wandering to an earlier mode of thought in recognising that not only the "proper," but the most interesting and instructive "study of mankind is man." Mr. Sturt at once puts his finger upon the spot when he says: "The Proton Pseudos, the besetting temptation of philosophy, not only in the present but in every other age, is the inclination to overlook the kinetic and dynamic character of human experience." The tendency of philosophers has been to neglect the element of activity in human beings—"That men are changing

[1] *Idola Theatri*. A Criticism of Oxford Thought and Thinkers from the Standpoint of Personal Idealism. By Henry Sturt. London and New York: Macmillan and Co. 1906.

dynamic beings interacting with the world of changing forces in which they live, has always been recognised by commonsense; but the philosophic thinker has been ever tempted to forget it." This tendency to regard the subject matter of philosophy as immutable or static Mr. Sturt calls the Passive Fallacy. This Passivity has had three results, in Intellectualism, Absolutism and Subjectivity, which are denominated the "Idols of the Theatre" by Mr Sturt. The consequences are the over emphasis of the intellect, the rejection of personality and the over emphasis on the subjective side of experience. In this volume the Idols are criticised mainly as ignoring personality and volition. Personal Idealism, starting from the individual, is the corrective of these philosophic errors. In working out the criticism which is a consequence of this new point of view Mr. Sturt enables us to realise the advantages it offers, and throws light upon many an interesting problem which has been confused by the prevailing submission to Hegel, whose day in English philosophy appears to be drawing to an end. The criticism of the Hegelians is profound as well as acute, and it is quite certain that the new school is a force which will have to be reckoned with, and is likely ultimately to triumph.

The title of Mr. Nicholson's book[1] might lead the reader to suppose that it is of a far more ambitious character than it pretends to be; to solve the many problems introduced would occupy far more time than the vicar of a parish can find at his disposal, if any man or number of men could solve them all. The volume we should be inclined to describe as a collection of notes for essays; they deal with religion under various aspects; human nature considered individually and collectively; man, from a national and ecclesiastical point of view; history, religious and secular. Each of these divisions has numerous sub-divisions, and all are dealt with with more or less brevity. The religious point of view of the vicar of Egham approaches Evangelicalism, and in politics we should take him to be a Conservative. How wide a field is covered by the questions considered may be seen by the headings of a few paragraphs—"What are the Mutual Relations of Rationalism and the Resurrection of Christ?"—"What are the Conditions Necessary for a good Conversationalist?" "Is there a connection between the Church of England as an Establishment, and the Preservation of the British Empire?"—The answer to the last question gave us a surprise, as we have always been in favour of Disestablishment, and if Mr. Nicholson is right we shall have to reconsider our position, for according to him Disestablishment would lead to a Republic, the severance of our Colonies, and "the Empire would evaporate in smoke;" though smoke is not the usual result of evaporation.

[1] *Man; or, Problems Ancient and Modern relating to Man, with Guesses at Solutions.* By William T. Nicholson, B.A., Vicar of Egham. London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co. 1906.

It is in this way—if there were no State Church there would be no State religion, the Monarch might be a Roman Catholic—but the Protestants would rather have no king than a Roman Catholic king, so the Republicans would join hands with the Protestants, and the throne would be hardly worth ten years' purchase. The sentiment which binds the Colonies to the Mother-Country would no longer exist, and the Empire would vanish! So the Established Church is necessary to the preservation of the Empire. Q. E. D. This reminds us of many of the arguments brought forward against Mr. Birrell's Education Bill.

We always find something interesting about the productions of the non-professional theologian or writer upon religious subjects; there is generally a frankness, honesty and *naïveté* about them which we do not find in the more learned, systematic, and often sophistical productions of the professional divine. *The True Object of Life*,[1] by Mr. G. F. Jelfs, is a work of this kind; a characteristic of this little book is the amount of it which consists of quotations. The professsional writer does not undervalue other people's writings nor hesitate to borrow from them, but he generally disguises what he borrows and passes it off as his own. Mr. Jelfs is more frank and does not mind giving us whole pages within quotation marks. While this method affords much interesting reading it gives us the impression of the contents of a note book rather than an original work. The extracts are well-chosen and cover a wide range, from Aristotle to Lord Avebury, Lucretius to Longfellow, Cicero to Cowper, Socrates to Martin Tupper, and so on. The general purport of the book is to recommend religion of the Unitarian type, sensible, amiable and hopeful.

We have received from Messrs. Watts a cheap reprint of Matthew Arnold's *God and the Bible* in a somewhat condensed form. While fully appreciating Arnold's lofty aim we cannot but feel that he was in the wrong in ignoring that Biblical criticism the progress of which has left his work far behind.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

For nine hundred years, *i.e.*, from the fifth century B.C. until the fifth century A.D., the Eleusinian mysteries may be regarded as the palladium of Greek Paganism. The testimonies of ancient writers in respect of them are too scanty, and not only contradictory, but often suspicious. In Mr. Hamilton Gatliff's translations of

[1] *The True Object of Life.* By George Frederick Jelfs, of Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, Barrister-at-Law. Hamilton: *Spectator* Printing Company. 1906.

Eleusis: her Mysteries, Ruins and Museum,[1] by Demetrios Philios—which is the latest monograph on the subject—we are informed that only one fact about these Mysteries is positively unassailable viz., that they were the dramatised version of the legend of Demeter and Cora, and included actions, scenes and dialogues (*τὰ δρώμενα, τὰ δεικνύμενα, τὰ λογόμενα*). These latter probably bore some analogy with the chanting of the Passion, which forms so striking a feature in Catholic ceremonial during Holy Week. The volume is well-illustrated and provided with a plan of the excavations carried out under the direction of the learned author. As a translation it reads smoothly.

It is indisputable that, among living Englishmen, none could be found better, or even so well, qualified to deal with the tangled history of Spain during the past century than Mr. Martin Hume, who had witnessed most of the principal events he recounts in *Modern Spain,*[2] from the Revolution of 1868 up to the death of Alfonso XII., and heard, in his youth, tales from aged relatives and their friends who had known Godoy and fought under Wellington and Hill. Had not Charles III., the greatest of the Spanish Bourbons, been succeeded by a fool who suffered himself to be made the cat's paw of victorious anarchy and atheism, this Niobe of nations might have escaped most of the miseries that subsequently overtook her. "Spain's greatness and Spain's ultimate misery," writes Mr. Hume, "arose from the same cause, namely, the extension of her interests and dominions beyond the power of control possessed by her own nation." Carlism is, he assures us, practically dead—killed by the increasing material prosperity of the Basque provinces. At the present moment the one burning question is "regionalism" in Biscay and Cataluña; nevertheless, in his opinion, for Spain, most of the auguries are hopeful. Like all the other volumes of the "Story of the Nations" series, *Modern Spain* is well illustrated and tastefully bound.

THE DRAMA.

Mr. Thomas Rea, M.A., who is lecturer in German and Teutonic Philology in the University College of North Wales, has, in *Schiller's Dramas and Poems in England*[3] produced a work which,

[1] *Eleusis: her Mysteries, Ruins, and Museum.* Translated from the French of Demetrios Philios. By Hamilton Gatliff, Officer of the Royal Order of the Saviour. London: Sidney Appleton.

[2] *Modern Spain.* By Martin Hume. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

[3] *Schiller's Dramas and Poems in England.* By Thomas Rea, M.A. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

in respect of accurate scholarship and unwearied research, can challenge comparison with the elaborated theses for the doctorate in philosophy that come to us from Germany, France, and Scandinavia. As the essay in question has been awarded a certificate for research, it would seem, that, though somewhat late in the day, our Universities have awakened to the desirability of encouraging independent investigation. Carlyle was the first British critic who was able to form an idea of the place of German literature in the history of universal literature. Mr. Rea shows that there is scarcely one of our leading writers of the first half of the nineteenth century who was unacquainted with Schiller's dramas. He is also of opinion that a good translation of *Die Braut von Messina* is required, and that new versions of the other dramas would not be out of place. As to Schiller's poems, the majority of versions are wretched performances, and not only misinterpret and interpolate the text, but ignore the metres of the original. Bulwer Lytton, for instance, substitutes iambic pentameter for Schiller's elegiacs; but neither Bowring nor Arnold-Foster is open to either charge. Not the least interesting feature in Mr. Rea's work is his occasional excursus into the large question of Schiller's influence on contemporary English men-of-letters.

BELLES LETTRES.

The religious novel of the ordinary type is not much in favour in these days with the general reader; but those of a sensational character, such as some by Miss Marie Correlli and Mr. Hall Caine, have unbounded popularity. We are inclined to class Mr. Arthur Lillie with these latter, though we do not suppose his story, *The Workshop of Religions*[1] will achieve the success of *Barrabas* or *The Prodigal Son*. The title is not a good one and does not suggest a somewhat sensational semi-historical religious novel. It is impossible to convey an idea of the plot, but persons belonging to the first period of Christianity figure in its pages, John the Baptist or Johannan the Baptiser, Herodias, Salome, and Saul of Tarsus play important parts in the story. The scene is laid at first in Judea and passes to India. We are constantly in the company of Nazarites and Essenes (perhaps they are the same) Mystics and Magic—the general effect is one of mystery, brilliant barbarism, religious fanaticism and intrigue. Mr. Arthur Lillie is at home in

[1] *The Workshop of Religions.* By Arthur Lillie. London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co. 1906.

all that pertains to magic and mystery, theosophy and the fanatical side of Judaism, and out of these and similar materials he has constructed an interesting and at times even a thrilling story, but we do not feel able to accept his picture of the cradle of Christianity as a satisfactory one.

Most of the principal characters in *Latter-day Sweethearts*[1] make each other's acquaintance on board a leviathan Atlantic liner bound for the Old Country. As far as beauty and charm are concerned, honours are pretty equally divided between Helen Carstairs, a belle of New York society, and Posey Winstanley, a hoydenish but loyal-hearted Southerner, unconscious, at the opening of the story, that her shabbily-dressed old father is a millionaire. The amazing tangle of their love affairs finds satisfactory solution in a dramatic and wholly unexpected way, and these heroines—"sweetly unlike, but yet alike, in this: they both are roses"—find the happiness they deserve. We are grateful to Mrs. Burton Harrison for *Latter-day Sweethearts*, which is, in every respect, worthy of its predecessors.

Fanny Lambert,[2] by Mr. H. de Vere Stackpoole, is an amazingly clever and amusing performance. The heroine and her father—for whose sake she is prepared, when ruin threatens him, to sacrifice voluntarily her artist-lover—are delightful in their happy-go-lucky unconventionality. To know her is to love her; and her priggish cousin, himself engaged to an heiress, succumbs to her fascinations as readily as does the elderly and gouty solicitor, whose sister's one object in life is to keep him off the shoals of matrimony. This is one of the brightest stories we have read for a long time; it deserves, and will, no doubt, attain, a wide circulation.

Of the nine short stories, all readable, and, for the most part, humorous, which compose *The Damask Girl*,[3] the titular story appeals to us least, by reason of its extravagance. By far the best is "The Scientist's Wife," and after this we would place "Call Again," which recounts the ingenious means by which a debt was recovered from a rich and unusually knavish Shylock. Mr. Morrison J. Swift possesses a delightful sense of quiet humour, but he has still something to learn in the difficult art of writing short stories.

Napoleon's ambition was insatiable, and, when half the crowns of Europe lay at his feet, the mirage of founding a vast empire in the East hovered before his mind's-eye with strange obsession, only to be in part dispelled after his defeat at the battle of the Nile.

In *Phantasma*,[4] Mr. A. C. Inchbold carries us back to the Egyptian campaign. He deserves congratulation on having availed himself, to the fullest extent, of the splendid possibilities presented to the

1 *Latter-Day Sweethearts.* By Mrs. Burton Harrison. London: T. Fisher Unwin.
2 *Fanny Lambert.* By H. de Vere Stackpoole. London: T. Fisher Unwin.
3 *The Damask Girl.* By Morrison J. Swift. New York: The Morrison J. Swift Press.
4 *Phantasma.* By A. C. Inchbold, London: William Blackwood & Sons.

novelist by this unhackneyed theme. He paints boldly from a generous palette, with the result that his pictures have caught the glow of Oriental life. One scene, that of Napoleon's presence at the Druses' sacrifice on Mount Carmel, will not be easily forgotten; but Nazli, Murad Bey's patriotic daughter, who dons the garb of a warrior, in order to drive the intruding French from her native land, is the central figure. This Egyptian Joan of Arc, who veils her identity under the title of "Wedded to War," is not exempt from feminine weakness; she loves André, and her love, doomed to a tragic ending, is returned.

Some might describe *The God of this World*,[1] by Mr. John B. Middleton, as a Socialist's dream; others, who are not necessarily worshippers of the Golden Calf, as a Socialist's nightmare. To a limited extent, it falls under the category of *romans à clef*. We confess to scant liking for the Church of England as by law established; but, with a knowledge of the self-denying lives of so many of her ill-paid clergy, it is not only ungenerous—to employ a mild and utterly inadequate term—but rank nonsense to stigmatise them, one and all, as literally grovelling at the shrine of Mammon. The story, such as it is, for it contains more plottings than plot, begins twenty years ago with the apostacy of the Primate's nephew. There is good dramatic material, and the author deals with it effectively; but the narrative soon becomes rambling. The destruction by electricity of Mammon's golden image, when set up for public adoration in the precincts of St. Paul's Cathedral, leads on to the Millennium, the date of which is fixed for October 7, 2036. Then "the combined nations of the Eastern and Western hemispheres" shall sign a convention under which all war is to cease and a "single tax" to be imposed on land values for the benefit of the community. To a wealthy banker and his pander, the chief officer of a crematorium, poetic justice is meted out. With the removal of these sinister personages, the universal acceptance of the Henry George's principles becomes a comparatively easy matter.

POETRY.

Professor Palgrave did not exaggerate when he described *Pearl* as "perhaps the most purely and ideally perfect specimen of our elder poetry which good fortune has left us." Who the author was remains unknown, but American scholarship has proved his literary indebtedness to the fourteenth eclogue of Boccaccio, to Boethius, and to the so-called Sir John Mandeville. *Pearl: a Fourteenth Century*

[1] *The God of this World.* By John B. Middleton. London: Kegan Paul, Trench Trübner & Co.

Poem[1] has been rendered into modern English by Mr. G. G. Coulton with great delicacy, and as far as possible in the metre of the original, for the general reader, who would hardly be able to read the original in Professor Gollancz's standard edition. A father who has lost his two-year old daughter falls asleep at her graveside, sees in a dream her glorified spirit, and is cured of his despair by her arguments. Such is the brief synopsis of the plot:

> "The Prince's yoke is ever light
> To those who love His peace divine,
> For I have found Him, both day and night,
> A God, a Lord, a Friend full fine.
> Thus mused I, stretched on earth outright,
> Plaining my Pearl with bitter brine,
> Committing to God that Jewel bright
> In Christës dear blessing and mine,
> That in the form of bread and wine
> The priest us showeth every day,
> Lord, make us servants true of thine
> And precious pearls unto Thee pay."

Mr. Nehemiah Dodge has followed up his *Christus Victor*, which we have already noticed in the *Westminster Review*, by *Mystery of the West*.[2] The title applies to a collection of twenty-one poems dealing partly with Scandinavian subjects, but particularly with Christopher Columbus. None of these latter rise beyond respectable mediocrity; but it cannot be denied that "Chant for the Children of Mystery"—which is obviously modelled on Walt Whitman, and, therefore, untrammelled by the recognised laws of prosody—is an effective achievement, owing much of its weird force to the device of occasionally introducing a verse with an abnormal number of beats. Thus:

> "Whisper ye pines and ye live-oaks that fringe the Atlantic,
> mingle your farewells with dirges of ocean!"

is followed by:

> "Ye fair-fronded palms, cocoholo, mahogany, rose
> wood, trailing gigantic vines, draping your
> scarlet, entangled and climbing to sun-
> light above the dark tropical forest—
> orchid and butterfly gleaming and
> flashing—murmur a requiem
> solemn and slow for the dead
> of the ages unknown and
> unnumbered!"

"Dirge of the Finns" is plaintively melodious. The retail price of the volume is $1.

[1] *Pearl: a Fourteenth-Century Poem.* Rendered into Modern English by G. G. Coulton, M.A. London: David Nutt.
[2] *Mystery of the West.* By Henry Nehemiah Dodge. Boston: Richard E Badger.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE LATE MRS. ADA S. BALLIN.

To the Editor of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

SIR,—The tragic death by misadventure last month of Mrs. Ada S. Ballin, the well-known editor and proprietor of *Baby*, *Womanhood* and *Playtime*, author of *From Cradle to School*, and the doyenne of all writers on health and beauty, is still fresh in the public memory; and the June numbers of the above magazines, containing, as they do, not only references to the deceased lady, but also articles from her own pen, are very pathetic reading. Mrs. Ballin was still in the full vigour of womanhood, and this makes her loss to the world all the sadder, especially when it is remembered what a friend she was to little children. Indeed, the "Ballin" baby had come to be a household word in many a home, and it is this aspect of her work that prompts me to suggest, through your valuable columns, what would, I think, be a fitting perpetuation of her memory.

All admirers of her particular cult—and their name is legion—know how much she did during her busy life for the mothers and babies of Britain, and in what way, therefore, could her memory be more fittingly perpetuated than by the endowment of a cot in a London Hospital? The Hospital for Sick Children, Great Ormond Street, has been suggested to me as the most suitable recipient of such a memorial, and it only remains for me to ask you to be kind enough to give publicity to my appeal, in order that it may reach as large a circle of sympathisers with the proposal as possible.

An executive committee is in course of formation, and Constance, Countess de la Warr, the Baroness de Bertouch, Mrs. L. Heaton Armstrong, Miss Violet Defries, Lord Byron, John Murray, Esq., and others, have consented to associate their names with the movement. Contributions, which will be gratefully acknowledged by me, should be sent to the Treasurer, "Ballin Memorial Fund," Stewart Johnson, Esq., Secretary, Hospital for Sick Children, Great Ormond Street, W.C.

I am,

Yours truly,

W. J. GOMERSALL (Rev.).

Fellow of the Royal Society of Literature.

1 STANLEY GARDENS,
HAMPSTEAD.

THE

WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

VOL. CLXVI. No. 2.—AUGUST 1906.

THE MONTH.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

The Income-Tax Inquiry.

UNDER the chairmanship of Sir Charles Dilke, the inquiry by the Select Committee of the House of Commons as to the possibility of graduating and differentiating the Income Tax goes merrily on, contributing to the gaiety, if not to the wisdom, of nations. Those Free Traders, *pour rire*, Mr. Chiozza Money, M.P., and Mr. Harold Cox, M.P., have both given evidence strongly supporting the principles of graduation and differentiation, and have submitted to the committee their respective schemes for the application of the same. That Mr. Chiozza Money, who contrives to be at the same time what Lord Halsbury might call "a sort of a Free Trader" and a Socialist, should favour methods of taxation which are designed to "get at" the wealthier classes is hardly to be wondered at, but it is surprising that they should be approved by Mr. Harold Cox, who is by way of being a sort of an Individualist, and who recently asked the Prime Minister "whether in any proposals that His Majesty's Government may make for dealing with the problem of the unemployed, they will take care that men and women now in employment are not thrown out of employment by the diminution, through taxation, of funds now spent by private persons in giving employment to the wage-earning classes." Surely it is in order to ask Mr. Cox himself "whether in his proposals dealing with the graduation and differentiation of the Income Tax he has taken care that men and women now in employment will not be thrown out of employment by the diminution, through such taxation, of

funds now spent by private persons in giving employment to the wage-earning classes." We are inclined to think that Mr. Cox has wholly overlooked this aspect of the matter.

"A Boomerang Tax."

The most drastic proposals for the graduation of the Income Tax were those put forward by Mr. Philip Snowden, M.P., who suggested that a surtax should be placed on all incomes over £5,000. Upon earned incomes between £5,000 and £8,000, he would impose a surtax of 6*d.* in the £, and upon "unearned incomes" a surtax of 1*s.* in the £, and he would proceed upon a graduated scale under which incomes of £50,000 and over would pay a surtax of 6*s.* in the £. Sir Charles Dilke pointed out that this would mean that incomes of £50,000 and upwards would pay in all a tax of 7*s.* in the £. "Quite so," said Mr. Snowden; and in answer to Mr. Hicks-Beach's question, "Don't you think such a tax would lead to a considerable portion of capital being sent abroad?" he replied, "Not so much as you would suppose. Land, for instance, could not be removed from this country." The land certainly could not be removed from the country. But the reply loses something of its force when one remembers that "land" is not "capital." It is true that much of the fixed capital of the country —buildings, machinery, and so forth—could not be removed; but there can be little doubt that so drastic a system of taxation would discourage the employment of large capitals in trade and industry, and would thus tend to throw men and women now in employment out of employment. As a matter of fact, the Income Tax is not so direct a tax as it is commonly supposed to be. It is "a boomerang tax." It is aimed at the capitalist, but before its course is run it hits the worker. It discourages trade and industry—it operates as a tax upon trade and industry, and therefore it is a direct infringement of true Free Trade principles.

A Dishonest Tax.

In addition to this, the Income Tax is not only in itself a dishonest tax, inasmuch as it takes from the individual what rightly belongs to the individual, but it is also a direct tax—the only sense in which it is truly a direct tax—upon honesty, since the man who makes an honest return must pay more than the man who understates his income. As we have repeatedly said, the Income Tax is sheer robbery, a graduated income tax is simply graduated robbery, and the heavier the graduation the greater the temptation to make a false return, and therefore the heavier the tax upon honesty. Mr. Snowden, no doubt, would object that graduation is primarily intended to apply to "unearned incomes," and therefore it would not take from any individual what rightly belongs to him. But there is, as a matter fact, no such thing as an "unearned income." It is, indeed, true

that huge incomes at present go to those who do not earn them, but how can the State rectify this by imposing heavily graduated taxation upon such incomes? It is surely the duty of the State to see to it that these incomes go to those who do earn them. Now all "unearned incomes" rest, directly or indirectly, upon land monopoly, and land monopoly exists because the State, instead of taking for public purposes the land values created by and therefore belonging to the whole community, allows this community-earned income to flow into the pockets of individuals. The first steps, therefore, is for the State to appropriate for State purposes this State-earned increment—(John Stuart Mill's inaccurate phrase, "the unearned increment," is responsible for much of the loose thinking on these matters to-day)—and to cease to appropriate incomes that the State has not earned. Were this done the "unearned incomes" of the landed classes would disappear as "unearned incomes" to appear as earned income in the coffers of the State, and the "unearned income" now "enjoyed" by the State would be left in the pockets of those to whom it justly belongs; while, in addition to this, the tax on land values would force all idle land into use, thus rendering the workers economically independent. Each man would then receive the natural recompense of labour, the full product of his toil, and there would be no surplus whatever remaining for "unearned incomes" of any description.

The Tax that Stimulates Industry.

Whereas the Income Tax is in itself both a dishonest tax and a direct tax on honesty, and whereas its economic effect is to discourage trade and industry, and to cause unemployment, it has never yet been realised with sufficient clearness that a tax on land values is not only an honest tax, entailing no penalties upon honesty nor upon trade and industry, but that from the economic point of view it is in itself a good tax, since, even if all the proceeds of the tax were thrown into the sea, it would mean the throwing open of the land to all who wish to use it. The taxation of land values is, indeed, the most important fiscal reform, the most important economic reform, the most important social reform, to which the Government stands pledged, for it affords the only possible foundation for sound finance, and the only means whereby economic independence and social justice can be secured. It will introduce a fairer principle—in fact, the fairest principle—of taxation, it will relieve industry of its present oppressive burdens, and, by forcing vacant land into the market, it will stimulate trade and industry, increase employment, relieve overcrowding and lessen rents. That this is no overstatement of the case we have frequently shown by citing the experience of our Australasian Colonies, and a White Paper recently issued supplies strong corroborative evidence. Commenting on this report even

the *Labour Leader*, Mr. Keir Hardie's paper, is moved to say:[1] "The movement for the taxation of land values will gain strength from the facts and figures contained in a Prussian official report which was published in 1904, and which is now embodied in a British Parliamentary paper just issued. The report states that practical experience has shown that taxation of real estate on the basis of the market value has proved a complete success. The report shows by statistics that this system of assessment has resulted in a more equitable distribution of taxation. To take an instance, the report states that in one commune in which, under the system of surtaxes on the State assessments, the land (not built upon) paid only 3 per cent. of the local taxes on real estate, the proportion was increased by the introduction of market value assessments to 36½ per per cent. of the local taxes, which led to a corresponding diminution of the proportion assessed on buildings from 97 per cent. to 63½ per cent. This method of assessment has also led to a considerable reduction in the assessment of the working class dwellings—in some cases to the extent of 30 to 40 per cent." It is to be regretted that it is impossible to place the case for the taxation of land values as against the graduation and differentiation of the Income Tax before the Select Committee. It is still more to be regretted that his Majesty's Government have as yet taken no steps to embody in each of the Lands Valuation (England and Wales, Scotland and Ireland) Bills now before Parliament a clause requiring the separate assessment of land values. Perhaps it is not too much to hope that the omission may be rectified during the forthcoming Autumn Session, so that the way may be cleared for the rating and taxation of land values next year.

Land Tax and Land Raiders.

While the official Labour Party in this country is for the most part concentrating upon the graduation of the Income Tax, it is noteworthy that the Labour Party in the Australian Federal Parliament, benefiting by the object lessons afforded by New Zealand, New South Wales, Queensland, and South Australia, is promoting a scheme providing for a tax of ½d. in the £ upon the capital value (equal to 10d. in the £ on the annual value) of all land exclusive of improvements. The tax is to be stiffly graduated against large estates, holdings valued at £5000 and over paying at the rate of 4d. in the £, while upon absentees there is to be levied a surtax of 50 per cent. But that the workers in this country are awakening to the importance of the land question is shown by the seizure of an island by a body of Highland crofters, and by the more recent raiding of land by the unemployed at Levenshulme, near Manchester, and at West Ham. Of course the pro-monopoly

[1] June 22, 1906

Press has done its best to ridicule the raiders, but that the utilisation even of such unpromising waste pieces of land affords a genuine and effective method of coping with the unemployed problem was shown years ago by Mayor Pingree—"Potatoe-patch Pingree," as he was called—of Detroit, U.S.A. Confronted by an unusually acute spell of unemployment, with hundreds of able-bodied men seeking work and finding none, Mayor Pingree conceived the idea of persuading the holders of vacant lots within the city to allow the men to use the land for market-gardening. Permission was granted, the unemployed were set to work, and the scheme proved a great success. What has been done in America can be done here, and what has been done on vacant city lots can be done, "and still more so," on the belts of idle or half-idle land that surround our big centres of population. But the thing must, of course, be done regularly and in order, and to this end the engine of taxation must be used to break down the barriers that fence out the idle hands from the idle lands.

Mr. Haldane's Army Scheme.

In regard to National defence the new Minister for War has declared for the "Blue Water School" as against what may well be called the "Blue Funk School." In vain Lord Roberts and Lord Milner had clamoured two days before for compulsory military training, that is to say for conscription. Mr. Haldane recognised that it is impossible to maintain at one and the same time both a big navy and a big army. According to the scheme he laid down, we must trust to the Navy and to the Volunteers for home defence. The functions of the Regular Army are to be (1) to provide the nucleus of an expeditionary force, and (2) to provide the drafts for the linked battalions in India and the Colonies; while the Militia are to engage to act as a first line of support to the Regular Army and to go abroad on the outbreak of war. Ten battalions of the regular army—eight of the line and two of the Guards—are to disappear, thus reducing the personnel by 20,000 men; but, in spite of this reduction, Mr. Haldane claims that by his scheme of reorganisation the efficiency of the army will be increased by fifty per cent., and that he will he able to mobilise in case of war a force which will contrast with the old force as three Army Corps to two. As illustrating Tory "mess, muddle, and make-believe," Mr. Haldane stated that with ninety-three batteries of artillery for home defence the country was only in a position to mobilise forty-two. To mobilise the whole of the ninety-three would take 10,000 more men and cost £600,000. However, he proposed to meet the difficulty, and at the same time to save £300,000 by drafting the 14,000 men of the garrison artillery militia into the Regular Artillery. The scheme is estimated to effect a saving of a

million and a-half per annum, but Sir Charles Dilke, less optimistic, puts the saving down at half a million only. The defects of the scheme are (1) that it provides for so large an expeditionary force, namely 150,000 men—(Regulars, 50,000; Reservists, 70,000; and Militia, 30,000); and (2) that it preserves the old cumbrous system of linked battalions for supplying the drafts for India and the Colonies. By abolishing this system, and setting up training depots to supply the necessary drafts, it should be possible to considerably reduce our standing army, and to effect a saving of several millions sterling; and we believe that ere long public opinion will compel the adoption of this course.

Our Three-Power Navy.

In regard to naval matters, some of the "Blue Water School" would seem to belong also to the "Blue Funk School." Instead of a two-Power standard our Navy is now up to a three-Power standard, and it is well known that, thanks to Free Trade, we can build both more quickly and more cheaply than any of our rivals. But the Board of Admiralty are not satisfied, and it is rumoured that while the majority of the Cabinet desire to reduce this year's shipbuilding programme by abandoning one of the two battleships of the *Dreadnought* class which it was proposed to lay down this autumn, three or four ministers are resolutely opposed to any such proposal. Lord Brassey, however, who is no mean authority on such matters, sees no cause for alarm, "The Navy," said he recently to a Press representative, "is in a most commanding position as regards completed first-class battleships, which are the chief element of naval strength Great Britain is in a better position than ever before. She has forty-three, while Germany has only sixteen, and France eleven. In armoured cruisers of the first-class Great Britain has forty-five, aggregating 531,000 tons; Germany seven, aggregating 67,000 tons; and France sixteen, aggregating 178,000 tons. Therefore, as regards our present strength, we are in a most commanding position, and the laying down of one or two ships may certainly be postponed without imprudence. It is part of the duty of a Liberal Government to economise in naval as well as military matters. Although the United States is building thirteen new ships, we do not regard her as a possible enemy, and we limit ourselves to France and Germany when comparing the numbers. We must also regard the relative rate of progress, which is much more rapid in the case of Great Britain. We are spending £12,000,000 on shipbuilding, including armaments, and France and Germany combined only £10,000,000." As a matter of fact we have been setting the pace in shipbuilding, and we can well afford to go slow. Indeed, if anything is to be done at the Hague Conference in the direction of the reduction of armaments, we must go slow.

Peace Helps Business Interests.

With the various Anglo-French and Anglo-German *ententes*—journalistic, municipal, and otherwise, with the projected Anglo-French Exhibition to be held at Shepherd's Bush in 1908, and with the "Parliament of Europe" meeting at Essex Hall—there can be no doubt that the spirit of Peace is abroad. And in this connection it is to be regretted that at the recent meeting of the Women Liberals of the Home Counties any encouragement should have been given to the proposal for the compulsory military training of the youth of the nation, which, as Miss Balgarnie pointed out, "would strengthen the spirit of Jingoism and retard social reforms that were calculated to effect far greater physical improvement than military drill could ever do." Even business men are beginning to realise that the greatest of business interests is peace. "The cause of peace," the *Daily News* points out, "is . . . powerfully advocated by Consul-General Oppenheimer, of Frankfort, in his report upon the trade of Germany during 1905. He says: 'The manufacturing circles are becoming ever more sensible to the importance of all political complications. The Algeciras Conference was as anxiously watched by the commercial world as by the world of diplomacy, and the differences which occurred in its initial stage had a decidedly unfavourable effect upon the business on the Stock Exchange. The importance which the economic world attaches to peace found expression also in the spontaneous and widespread endeavours to bring about a better understanding between Germany and the United Kingdom. Germany has learned how easily national ill-feeling can impede the exchange of goods which is then for the time diverted into wrong channels. In Germany the economic circles more than all others felt the necessity to proclaim that there was a genuine desire to establish and foster friendly relations with Germany's great commercial customer and competitor.'"

Free Trade Progressing in Germany.

Protectionists too often overlook the fact that our trade rivals are our customers as well as our competitors, and that both their custom and their competition are good for us—their custom affording us markets for our goods, and their competition keeping our industrial and commercial methods up to date and preventing our becoming slack and stale. Mr. Oppenheimer's comments upon "the victory of Free Trade at the last elections in the United Kingdom" go to show also that Free Trade principles are making considerable progress in the Fatherland. "In German industrial circles," he says, "the view is not seldom expressed that the German customs tariff has been overdone, and that every day brings fresh proofs that British industry now has the advantage over the German. It is an oft-repeated argument that the British workman enjoys the cheaper

food and the British manufacturer the cheaper raw material, and that in view of these facts alone the competitive capacity must be affected. Even if the change be not sudden, German manufacturers expect it in the end, and they are beginning already to take it into account. It would not be surprising if the apprehension thus expressed should steadily swell the number of the convinced Free Traders in Germany." And he adds that: "British manufacturers can in many instances procure raw material and half-finished goods more cheaply than the German competitor, and several German manufacturers—*e.g.*, in the paper trade—contemplate the establishment of branch factories in the United Kingdom."

Sidelights on Tariff Reform.

Such extracts would hardly have made pleasant reading at Mr. Chamberlain's seventieth birthday party. And even more unpleasant reading was provided by the Board of Trade returns for June, which, by a curious coincidence, were issued on the very day of the great Birmingham celebrations.[1] The returns showed that during the first six months of this year imports had increased by £27,441,000 on the phenomenal figures of 1905, and totalled no less than £300,000,000 for the half-year; while exports had increased by £24,887,000, aggregating, without re-exports, £180,600,000. It is significant, too, that of the increase in imports more than two-thirds, or £18,600,000, consisted of food, drink, tobacco, and raw materials—food, drink, and tobacco, £5,700,000; raw materials, £12,900,000; while of the increase in exports no less than £20,400,000 is accounted for by manufactures, which total over 148 millions sterling for the half-year. Iron and steel are "going"—indeed, going strong—for they have increased in the six months by £3,451,000. And in the same period our entrepôt, or re-export trade—which, by the way, would be absolutely annihilated by Chamberlainism—reached the record figure of £44,400,000. The imports, exports, and re-exports for the half-year totalled £525,000,000, a rate which would, on twelve months' working, give us a total trade of £1,050,000,000! But, in spite of these figures, and in spite of the eloquent figures of the General Election, Mr. Chamberlain professes to be undismayed—nay, not only undismayed, but confident of success. Speaking at the 107th sitting of the Tariff Reform Commission (this farcical inquiry, it would seem, is not yet complete) he boldly declared that "nothing that had happened had shaken in the slightest degree his own conviction of the necessity for the work undertaken, and of its certain ultimate success." He even ventured to add that "he did not hesitate to say that the information now in the possession of the Tariff Reform Commission was the most valuable trade information in the

[1] July 7.

United Kingdom," a statement greeted by the Commission with loud applause. Mr. Chamberlain, no doubt, gleans some crumbs of comfort from the proceedings of the Congress of the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire, but the Protectionist manufacturers of our Colonies are simply exploiting his movement for their own ends. In the meantime, it must have struck even Mr. Chamberlain that, by a strange fatality, his friends are always giving him away. To the Tariff Reform envelopes made in Germany, to the Gainsborough chairs made in Russia, to Pearson's *Christmas Extra* printed in Holland, we have now to add the Birmingham celebration torches made in Germany! The great torchlight procession, and these other matters, throw some interesting side-lights on Tariff Reform.

"The White Man's Burden."

We note with pleasure the strong protests from both parties in the recent House of Lords debate on the Congo horrors, and we trust that no time will be lost in adopting Lord Lansdowne's suggestion that "if these abuses continue we should claim our right to appoint Consuls in the Congo." We believe, with him, that "the presence of Englishmen located in the centres of trade would be worth quite as much as a 'whole row' of inspectors or officials belonging to the Administration of the Congo Free State." The Concessionaire Companies, as his lordship pointed out, make enormous profits, the £20 shares of some of them being quoted at something like £600, and they would not willingly allow the inspectors or officials of the Congo Free State to interfere with their "business" methods. We are glad to note also that there is a disposition to use the Porte's request for our consent to an additional 3 per cent. duty on imported goods as a lever to enforce the adoption of really effective reforms in Macedonia. But it must be obvious that our moral influence in regard to such matters as these loses a great deal of its force by reason of the recent executions in India and in Egypt, by reason of the terrible slaughter of the native "rebels" in Natal (547 killed at Umvoti, with "no white casualties"!), by reason of the continuance of Chinese slavery in South Africa, and, to mention a smaller matter, by reason of such scandals as that of the Ceylon Pearl Fishery concession. It is true that in respect of these matters the present Government are, for the most part, reaping the tares sown by their predecessors; but they have been nothing like vigorous enough and drastic enough in their administration of the affairs of the Empire, and in their undue regard for "continuity" they have too often disregarded the claims of justice. The Prime Minister recently told us, for instance, that responsible Government cannot be fully established in the Transvaal before the beginning of next year; and it is announced that the importation

of Chinese serfs is not to cease till November next, when the reform will be nearly a year overdue. If they would regain the moral influence that this country has undoubtedly lost, they must lose no time in setting to work to put their own house thoroughly in order. If they desire their representations in regard to the Congo horrors to carry due weight, they must see to it that throughout the British Empire the white man shoulders his own burden, instead of leaving it for the black man or the yellow man to bear.

Catalogue of Chinese Crimes.

In a recent letter to the Press, Mr. Frederick Mackarness, M.P., calls attention to the gruesome catalogue of crime committed by the Chinese serfs of the Rand:—12,960 convictions for various offences during the past twenty-two months; 1311 Chinese out of 50,000 confined in the prisons of the Transvaal on May 21 last; twenty-three murders and seventy acts of housebreaking in the three months of March, April, and May. And, in order to bring home to the people the meaning of these sinister figures, he points out that "out of a population of thirty-four millions in England and Wales the convictions for twelve months in 1904 were only 198,395," whereas "if they were brought up to the ratio of the Chinese convictions, they would exceed a total of 4,000,000;" that in England and Wales the daily average population in gaol is only 21,360, whereas if it were brought up to the Chinese ratio it would reach a total of over 87,000; and that "the average annual number of murders in England and Wales is 171," whereas "if it rose to the ratio of the Chinese murders in the Transvaal, the number would be over 2400." "The increase of crime," Mr. Mackarness adds, "goes hand in hand with an increase of desertion. The Tories have joyfully seized upon the fact that very few Chinamen have ventured to take advantage of the wonderfully disguised invitation to go home which Lord Selborne and the Chamber of Mines reluctantly dangled before the coolies. But they do not explain, why, if the Chinese are happy in the mines, they desert in thousands into the country, where the certain fate awaits them of a brief life of crime to be terminated either by starvation, the rifles of the white inhabitants, or the gallows. The Chinese prefer even to face these things rather than the evils of the mines. In July last only 245 deserted. In January the number had risen to 780, and in March to 1169," while "the total desertions for March and April were 1990." The situation is aggravated by the recent news that Kaffirs are now joining the Chinese in committing crimes upon the white people, and that at least one horrible outrage upon a white woman has been perpetrated. "Moreover, there is the still darker picture in the background of the inevitable unnatural vice to which the Bishop

of Hereford and Lord Stanmore alluded without contradiction in the House of Lords a few days ago." Mr. Mackarness concludes by demanding that the importation of Chinamen shall cease (8,000 of the 16,000 licenses issued in such wholesale fashion in November last are still open !), and that the Chinamen already in South Africa shall be repatriated as soon as possible. "It is said that the Government is deterred by economic and financial reasons from acting. But (he argues) in the first place what claim to compensation could the mine-owners make good against an Executive which deported the Chinese on the ground that they were a danger to the State? And secondly, what damages could be proved if the monopoly of the Chamber of Mines was broken down, and a free supply of Kaffirs was procured to take the place of the repatriated Chinese, and at the same time white men were encouraged to work in the mines? There is strong evidence that this could be done; and if it can be done it is an answer to the economic dangers with which we are threatened by the mine-owners." Not only should the monopoly of the Chamber of Mines in regard to the supply of Kaffirs be broken down, but a still more serious monopoly, that of the gold mines themselves, should also be broken down. "The economic dangers with which we are threatened by the mine-owners" should be met by threatening them with, and not only threatening, but actually imposing, a stiff tax on Rand values. Compensation is due, not from the British people to the mine-owners, but from the mine-owners to the British people, to the Boers and to the Kaffirs and the Chinamen as well. The two chief movers in the Jameson Raid, in the engineering of the war, and in the introduction of Chinese slavery have gone to their last account. It is time that the minor personages implicated were called to account here and now.

Rider Haggard's Scheme Condemned.

The Departmental Committee appointed to consider Mr. Rider Haggard's scheme for agricultural settlements in Canada and other British Colonies has reported adversely. They point out that, whereas it would cost £300,000 to establish in Canada a Colony of 1,500 families, that sum would enable at least 6000 families to emigrate to Canada in the ordinary way. The Committee say, "We have examined in detail Mr. Rider Haggard's scheme, and stated that we are unable to recommend that it should be adopted, as (amongst other reasons) we consider the proposed Colony to be too large; the management by a religious body [the Salvation Army] undesirable; the precedents he cited inapplicable; the suggestion that men going from English cities should take up land in Canada without previous Colonial experience unwise; the expense greater than he calculates; the prospect of the return of

the money advanced uncertain; and the difficulty as to the selection of settlers serious, if not insurmountable." The Committee say that "whether we turn to Canada, South Africa, or Australia, we fail to find an instance of a thoroughly successful effort at colonisation, and they favour as an alternative State-aided emigration. Unfortunately the Committee had no power to take evidence as to the possibility of colonising the millions of idle acres here at Home; nor do they seem to have given much thought to the prospects that await the emigrants on landing in Canada. They glibly say that "they can then take up land independently," but what are the facts of the case?

Land Monopoly *versus* **Colonisation.**

The *Canadian Single Taxer*[1] says: "Thousands are crowding our shores in search of the free land promised by our Government, to find what? Only to find that all land anywhere near shipping facilities has been given away to railways or sold to land companies. One land company has a full page advertisement in one of the city dailies, offering 2,000,000 acres of the best land at from eight dollars to ten dollars an acre. The Canadian Pacific Railway offer millions more at prices of from five dollars upwards, according to location, and dozens of land companies have bought from the Government the privilege of holding up incoming settlers. . . . Everywhere you go you find the actual settlers are surrounded by great stretches of vacant land owned and held for a rise. . . . When single taxers talk of land monopoly in Ontario, they are told to go to the North-West, and get all the land they want for nothing, yet twenty years or so after the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, although there are scarcely 500,000 persons in the Territories and Manitoba, all the land anywhere near the railways is monopolised, and can only be used by paying blackmail to the forestaller." The fact of the matter is that as things stand to-day land monopoly is simply driving emigrants from this country into the arms of land monopoly in Canada. Tax land values and kill land monopoly here and in Canada, and the probabilities are that the workless would colonise the Homeland instead of emigrating to Canada. But if they did emigrate to Canada the taxation of land values would at all events secure them a much better chance than is offered them to-day. And in that case we should not hear so much of the failures of colonisation. Artificial colonisation under present unjust conditions is bound to fail, but set the land free, and allow the Colonists to select themselves and settle on their own account, and a very different tale will be told.

[1] Toronto, January 1906.

Game *versus* Man.

How land monopoly prevents the developments of our own land, the colonisation of the Home country, is illustrated by an incident noted in the *Daily News* obituary of the late Sir Wilfred Lawson, Bart., M.P., Radical and Temperance reformer. The incident is also a fine illustration of the genial baronet's high moral character. Learning that his steward, in granting a new lease to one of his tenants for ten years, had increased the rent by £80 per annum, as the result of the farmer's energetic improvement of his holding, he forwarded the tenant a cheque for £800, saying he returned the money because it belonged to the farmer and not to himself. In this case the tenant did not suffer, but we are afraid that very few landlords are troubled by such scruples, and that the tenant as a rule is not only called upon to pay rents on his own improvements, but has to pay rates on them as well. In the *Daily News* of July 4, Mr. Fred Horne tells us also how the tenant of North Tadworth Farm, encouraged by one landlord to set up a fruit-growing and jam-making business which paid some £5,000 a year in wages, found his business ruined because of the determination of a subsequent purchaser of the farm to preserve rabbits rather than fruit. And from a recent issue of the *North Mail*[1] we learn that some moorland farmers in Yorkshire have been ordered to remove their sheep from the hillsides lest, forsooth, they disturb the grouse or the pheasants. We trust that it will not be long before the Government, by the taxation of land values, make it economically impossible for the landlords to play such pranks.

Foreign Affairs.

The French Government and the French people are to be congratulated upon the final triumph of justice in the Dreyfus case; and Captain Dreyfus and Colonel Picquart are to be congratulated upon the vindication of their honour and upon their reinstatement in the army. It is pleasing, too, to learn that the Government intend to render special honour to the memory of M. Emile Zola, whose bold *J'accuse!* undoubtedly marked the turning-point of the whole case. That, on the other hand, General Mercier, and those who acted with him, should be retired from the service, and removed from the roll of the Legion of Honour, would seem to be the least that justice demands. ——In Russia the grim deadlock till continues. Both army and navy are seething with mutiny—so much so that it is not considered safe for the British Fleet to visit Cronstadt; twenty-three out of the forty-nine European provinces of the Tzar are stricken by famine, and the executioners and the "black hundreds" still carry on their sanguinary work. The democracy and the bureaucracy are at death-grips, and the issue is as yet uncertain. It is all to the good,

[1] Newcastle, June 6.

however, that the Duma still survives, in spite of threats of kidnapping and suppression. The truth is that the Government must have money. If the Duma goes their credit with Europe goes, so the Duma remains, impotent as yet, but endowed with great latent potentialities which—heaven grant it—may yet find scope.——The outstanding feature of American politics just now is what is known as "the Bryan boom." Everything points to Bryan as the next Democratic candidate for the Presidency, and the indications are that the fight will be waged on anti-Protectionist and anti-Socialist lines. When the news of his endorsement for the Presidential nomination of his party reached Mr. Bryan at Berlin on June 11, he refused to discuss the subject of nominations, on the ground that it is too early to consider the question of the Presidential candidate for 1908, but dealing with political issues, he said: "Before leaving home I tried to distinguish between Democracy and what can properly be called Socialism. Democracy recognises competition as legitimate, and tries to protect the competitive principle from attack. Socialism sees competition as an evil to be eliminated by public ownership and operation of all means of production and distribution. While this distinction between Democracy and Socialism should not be overlooked, the democratic platform must be one of progress and reform, and not merely of opposition to Republican policies or Socialistic ideas." And he added: "In our fight for the absolute elimination of private monopolies, and for the regulation of corporations in general, it is necessary that the party shall be free from any suspicion of alliance with the corporate interests that have been dominating American politics. To this end campaign contributions must be limited to those who have the public interest to advance. I trust that public sentiment will require all parties to keep their books open, so that hereafter no party will be under private obligations to shield corporate offenders."[1] This is the straight utterance of a straight man. We trust that Mr. Bryan, defeated by corruptionist methods in 1896 and again in 1900, may in 1908 succeed in carrying the flag of Freedom to victory.

[1] *Chicago Public.*

THE POWERS PRESERVATIVE OF PEACE.

When, in the closely-knit community of the *Kulturnationen*, as distinguished from the merely civilised nations, differences and disagreements arise between those two great members of it who hitherto had regarded each other with amiability, the destruction of the perfect balance of national sentiment is felt at once, and grows to be a dangerous element in its influence upon all the others.

This law is the more powerful in its evil operation when such a state of feeling is engendered between those two nations, the strongest of the group, who alone of all the rest had never met in opposition, but often in co-operation, and between whom so close a relationship of race, culture, political affinity and respective regnancy prevails, as to furnish the best reason for the existence of this splendid sympathy in the past and the strongest hope for its maintenance in the future. That this most desirable equipoise of goodwill between Britain and Germany has been disturbed of late is regrettable but true, yet the mutually expressed desire for its restoration is the most confirmative sign of the inherent sympathy of the two peoples.

Various causes, in themselves insignificant, may operate to produce a coolness or estrangement between friendly nations, in especial, if the creation of such antagonistic feelings redound to the advantage of the weaker members of the group of nations seeking to profit by the dissension of the stronger. That the happily now-vanishing discords and misunderstandings between the great insular Power and its Continental sister-nation were partly due to such insidious machinations is doubtlessly true, but the major part of them may be traced to the mutual suspicions and misinterpretations of motives occasioned by commercial rivalry, and to that deplorable propaganda instituted by the newspapers of each country and fostered by politicians of a certain class. Though the newspapers express, in a way, the national sentiment, the reverse is equally true, for they are able to create the sentiments which they afterwards reflect. In this way the national atmosphere becomes electrically charged, and at the least flash on either side a widespread indignation prevails, and glib journalists,

seated in their revolving-chairs, speculate on war, and, speculating, almost declare it; the people read and, reading, believe, and the interactive asperities grow from bad to worse. Of wars that have been brought about by newspapers creating an uncontrollable hate and hysteria which re-acted upon the Government, the Spanish-American War is a late and luminous example. The idea of a modern war between the two great Germanic peoples, inspired by nothing more than the minor grievances each may have against the other, is one so incompatible with reason and justice and the ever-widening conceptions of progress and humanity, that it should be utterly untenable, and yet we hear it calmly discussed and even proposed as a thing inevitable, by those who fancy they have their country's welfare and honour at heart!

Although the great Powers of to-day are loth to relinquish their stupendous and expensive armaments, and to dismiss into other lines of activity the vast organised classes, military and naval, who find their advantage in upholding the dogma of force, it is apparent, nevertheless, that its practice is being relegated to the semi-barbarous or imperfectly civilised nations in distant parts of the globe. The army and navy of each country have assumed a purely defensive and preventive character, a form of necessary evil, slowly falling into desuetude. The endeavour and duty of the Statesmen of this day is to preserve the established, successfully-maintained harmony between the European Powers, to prevent all dangerous discords in the Concert of Europe. To strengthen the security of his country's position, the Statesman forms coalitions of ratified or purely sentimental fellowship between his own nation and that one which he believes will help him to a position of immunity from the others. But in so far as this policy of a political partnership or confederation of cordiality does not guarantee the peace of the other nations or forms no bar to the outbreak of war among them, so long must such a purely sentimental understanding be considered futile and insufficient for universal good.

If a coalition or agreement between two Powers is to act as a deterrent of war and preservative of peace among neighbouring nations, than the strongest union of that character, the one most effectual, influential and wide-reaching, would be a coalition between the two strongest Powers. This, necessarily, would have to be not a mere easily disturbed, almost personal expression of goodwill, but a solemnly ratified and sacredly conceived compact—a clear, open declaration and intelligent understanding of the ends of the alliance to and by the Powers, the public, and the world. The selfish principles of commercial combination and competition could have no place in it, but only the dictates of the noblest impulses or aspirations of humanity. As the great men of different

countries strive for the advancement of their prosperity or position, so should the nations of the world strive for the improvement of conditions universally affecting them all.

A close friendship between Britain and Germany would form a union of such impregnable strength as to be able to dictate and maintain that policy and state of universal peace which all nations concede to be indispensable. The recently, let us hope, firmly established *entente cordiale* between Great Britain and France was a step of the right sort, but not in the right direction. By this is meant that, considering its practical power of preserving peace in Europe, of upholding the traditions of an armed neutrality and furthering the inter-relative security of the nations of the Old World, it is less effective in power, less comprehensive in application than if such an agreement or mutual understanding had been formed between the two powerful, kindred nations, naturally designed to be allies—not rivals. The realisation of such an international understanding would certainly have taken place with England and Germany had not the existence of a superficial animosity prevented advances on either side. This temporary disharmony, it is well to note, is slowly passing away, and the discussion of such questions as that which inspires this essay is the most enlightening evidence of the new feeling.

Britain and Germany are natural allies. Cohesion of race must still be the chief decisive factor in stimulating the sympathy of one people towards another. In modern times purely political or diplomatic combinations which ignore the national predilections of the intelligent masses of to-day are destined to failure. The United States of America, a nation whose origin is Anglo-Saxon, is commonly held to be the Power most closely related to England. Yet it has of late been demonstrated that the Anglo-Saxon element in the United States is a constantly decreasing one, that it is already overshadowed and outnumbered by the prolific Teutonic strains, as well as being gradually eliminated by the ceaseless admixture of other races, slowly commingling. The United States are not a nation of homogeneous people, and when, after vast periods of time, they may have become such, they will no longer be Anglo-Saxon. In this age affinity of race, of form of Government, of national ideals outweigh the mere affinity of language, a language which in the American nation is undergoing a development distinct and separate. The geographical situation of the United States, as the Power of the New World, as well as Republican traditions, annul the practibility of her alliance with any Power of the Old. Herself experiencing no necessity for an alliance, it is naturally not to her advantage to make any.

It is, therefore, not in a formal alliance with a semi-barbarous, newly-civilised Oriental Power, nor in the interchange of courtesies

between herself and a Latin people, foreign in temperament, race, religion, ideals, form of government, and genius of language, nor in a remote independent Transatlantic Power that England has to seek her natural ally, but in her own hemisphere, in a race and nation more closely related in all essential and significant points. The fact that relations so pleasant could lately have been established between two countries so constantly and historically antagonistic as France and England is proof positive that the merely temporary misunderstandings affecting England and Germany should offer no obstacle to the consumption of an end so advantageous to both—and to the world. This has been the aim and ambition of some of the wisest, most clear, and far-seeing Statesmen of both nations.

Germany is, in a sense, the youngest of all the European Powers. Long has this country been forced to wait for its heritage of the ages. It was impoverished through being the battle-ground of Europe for centuries; it was divided among its various kingdoms in internecine civil wars. Its successful battles were those of the spirit rather than those of arms. Despite the heroic deeds achieved by the indomitable little State of Prussia in the eighteenth century under the great Frederick, Germany was no forceful factor among the nations of the Continent, no independent, corporate entity of a nation until the creation of a greater and united Germany thirty-five years ago. It is in relation to the manifestation of her national individuality and the assumption of her place in the conclave of the Powers, as well as her remarkable and vigorous development, that she is to be conceived as the youngest of all the Powers. In comparison the United States are of respectable antiquity—though it is but lately since they, too, have assumed a place as a world-power.

Notwithstanding the fact that the purpose of all modern armaments is purely and primarily of a defensive and prohibitive nature, it has been repeatedly stated that Germany was building her navy with only an aggressive purpose in view, and that this aggression was, in particular, directed against Britain and her dominance of the seas. The "reptile Press" of both lands has swarmed with variations upon this idea, so false yet so fascinating. For a long time "invasion" was held up as a bugbear to the people, and political writers forsook and forgot their profession and took to romancing. The erroneous interpretation of Germany's motives in enlarging her navy has given rise to that distrust and misapprehension in the minds of the English people which more than all else has produced the international friction. No one would go so far as to question the right of Germany to construct a formidable navy, though all question her reasons for doing so. Her coast-line is not long enough, it is said, to require naval defence—her colonies not important enough. Strangely has the necessity of defending her extensive merchant marine been overlooked, and the fact that

most of the decisive battles of the future are apt to be naval encounters. A modern nation without a navy apportioned to its commercial and political importance weakens the one and loses the other. No one regards with ill-will or suspicion the frequently discussed plan of enlarging England's army. It is remarkable, too, that no other nation has seen in Germany's navy a menace to her own, and that England has seen it in no other.

The intimate relationship between the two great Germanic nations is fundamentally too deep and strong to rupture their friendship entirely, though this may for a time have been "sicklied o'er" by lamentable unpleasantness.

Mankind is attaining, but has not yet attained in its organisation, those lofty levels where force shall be eliminated and reason alone control the destinies of confederated man. The greater Powers, while all favourable to universal arbitration and acknowledging its validity and justice, hesitate to surrender what, under present conditions, is their only mode of defence, retaliation or aggression. It therefore behoves the more enlightened, the more powerful and racially-allied nations, to use their strength for the common good. Among the nations of the world, no good is so great as the preservation of peace. Modern war is a curse that crushes the victor with the vanquished.

Innumerable advantages to both would result from an alliance or even a close friendship based on moral principles between Britain and Germany. In the immense superiority of the Navy of Great Britain and in the corresponding superiority of the military equipment of Germany, the most obvious and cogent reasons for this compact stand plainly forth. Conditions and human developments seem to have provided against the possibility af these two nations ever meeting in combat, by setting one in the sea and creating a great navy to defend the island, and by making the other practically an inland power with a vast army to protect itself against its neighbours. Against each other the sea power of England and the land power of Germany, as far as invasion is concerned, would be futile—united, they mutually complete each other.

The moral effect of such a coalescence of sentiments would be enormous, and reinforced by incomparable naval and military power, could exercise a benevolent authority and influence over the rest of the world. Without disturbing in any way the pleasant relations existing between two countries, it would lead to a gradual extension of the neighbourly idea of the *entente cordiale*, or of the theory or desire of peace into a practice of it, to embrace, finally, all the nations of earth. In this great work the masculine or Teutonic powers must lead, since the feminine or Latin powers, being the weaker, cannot.

The noblest and only unselfish reason for such a consolidation of

a common ideal and ambition is that, in humanity's work, organisation and a fixed purpose are necessary to the pioneer nations as they stride in advance, paving the way for progress towards that future, yet visible goal which, once attained, shall render it no longer necessary to maintain peace, but only to enjoy it.

Herman Scheffauer.

THE COMING HAGUE CONFERENCE.

In the recent resolution calling for a reduction of military expenditure, the House of Commons gave ostensible support to the method of effecting this purpose by an international agreement for the reduction of armaments. One cannot doubt that in this the House did more than it intended. It would appear that, in the ardour of its impulse to give support to the main part of the resolution, the latter portion, relating to the means of carrying out its purpose, was overlooked; and thus what some minds cannot regard as other than a very unsatisfactory scheme was endorsed.

At the first Hague Conference one section occupied itself with schemes for the limitation of armaments; and, after pointing out the many difficulties, they let the subject drop. To infer from this that no such scheme is practical would not be wise; but we are bound to call upon those who propose this method of dealing with the problem to show how it can be practically carried out. One objection to any scheme for the limitation of armaments is the difficulty of securing a satisfactory ratio. To take the simplest form of such an agreement—one relating to amount of expenditure only. On what basis is the amount of each nation to be determined? Are all to be alike? Is it likely the greater nations will agree to that? Then what other? One proposal is that the agreement shall be not to exceed the average expenditure of the preceding three years. This would be satisfactory to the nations which have maintained a high standard during this period, but it is not likely to be acceptable to those that have been left behind. The great defect, however, of this method, is that it would be impossible for any of the nations to have assurance that the others were faithfully carrying out the agreement. Each nation has control of its own resources, and it would not be difficult for any to violate the agreement without the others knowing it. Even in those States where military expenditure is publicly stated, there are ways by which the nation's fighting forces might be considerably increased without showing it at once. It would not be difficult, if war should be threatening, to induce, let us say, a patriotic firm of ship-builders to build a vessel on credit, with assurance of future payment; nor would it be difficult to raise money privately and secretly in the same way. Can any such scheme be regarded as satisfactory?

If a scheme for the limitation of armaments could be carried out, it would be one of relation. It would be the maintenance at a stationary ratio of certain proportionate forces. If we are anxious to have this relation kept—as the proposal of such a scheme would imply—why don't we try to keep it without regard to agreements with other nations? In our modesty, we have assumed that we are entitled to keep a naval force equal to those of any other two nations. But this proportion has not been maintained. And by whom has it been infringed? Not by other nations, but by us. We have so far exceeded this proportion during recent years that our naval forces are now about equal to the combined forces of any other three nations. To an outside observer our position must appear ridiculous. It will seem incredible that this increased expenditure, about which we appear to be anxious to make agreements for its limitation, is not in the least caused by compulsion. If we desire to have agreements with other nations for the limitation of armaments, which must be based on a ratio of forces, why don't we show our earnestness by keeping the ratio? The fact of our nation being the worst offender places us at a disadvantage for making a proposal of this kind. Other nations must think that our position does not betoken sincerity. Does it not lay on us, as sincere folk, to adjust our position before making a proposal of this nature to other nations.

Are we not in danger of overlooking the real nature of the evil, however, from preoccupation with its most obvious feature? Armaments are constantly growing, so it appears on the face that we must check the increase by artificial regulation. But this is merely lopping the extreme branches; it is not going to the root of the evil. It is the whole problem of militarism that we have to deal with. To merely arrange that there shall be no increase of expenditure on armaments while the nations are at peace—for no nation will consent to be bound when engaged in war—and to leave them as free as ever to fall to war, is not a satisfactory way of dealing with it. To plan for the artificial regulation of armaments is to regard the evil only from the economic standpoint. But the evil is essentially of a moral nature, and we can never deal with it satisfactorily till we approach it from the moral standpoint.

The only effective way to deal with any evil is to seek the cause and alter that. What is the nature of the evil with which we are concerned? Why do the nations provide these large armaments, and what is the cause of their constant growth? The reason is that each wishes to be able to assert its authority in any affair of difference that may arise between it and other nations. But is it well that differences between civilised nations should be settled in this way? We do not expect, we do not allow, citizens to settle their differences one with another by violent means: if they cannot settle

them peaceably between themselves, they must appeal to a recognised judicial authority. Should the code for the nation be lower than that for the single man? Ought not the nations to settle their differences by appeal to justice? It has been generally allowed that they ought: as a theory, we have given approval to the principle of arbitration. Let the nations establish the practice of appealing to an Arbitration Court for the settlement of all their differences, and reduction of armaments will inevitably follow. They will reduce them because they will have no real use for them at their present size. How is it that individual citizens are under no necessity to make agreements for the limitation of personal expenditure on instruments of violence? If any man desires to lay out a large part of his income in this way he may do so; he is not bound by agreements with other men to limit his expenditure in this direction. But there is no such disposition. Why? Because men don't spend money on things that are useless. So would the establishment of the practice of settling all their differences by appeal to justice influence the nations. When this shall be done, nations will be as little disposed to spend money on instruments of violence as are individual citizens.

It will be asked, if this be true, why have not the recent arbitration treaties already had such an effect? The reason is that they are not thorough. They apply only to "questions of a juridical character or relating to the interpretation of existing treaties"; and by further stipulation that they shall apply only to such matters as do not involve "the vital interests, the independence or the honour" of the contracting parties, a way is provided to avoid taking even these to arbitration, since no difference arises which may not be claimed to affect the vital interests or the honour of the nation. Thus they really bind the nations to nothing. They are, to speak plain truth, sham agreements. They have a certain value, as indicating that the nations are beginning to see that the solution of the problem lies in arbitration; but they show also that they yet fear to trust themselves to it.

If we are to benefit we shall have to accept arbitration thoroughly. We shall have to bind ourselves in sincerity with other nations that all differences that may occur between us and them shall be submitted to an Arbitration Court for settlement. There must be no exceptions of any nature. The proposal to bind ourselves in this manner will evoke strong objections. It will be said to be imprudent. Many people will point to the reservations of the existing treaties as showing that the prudent and experienced statesmen who formed them see that unreserved committal would be unsafe. We invite these to show how it would be unsafe. We cannot allow our judgment to be influenced by assertions. It is

questionable whether ever a beneficial public proposal escaped opposition from prejudiced and short-sighted people.

To prevent misunderstanding, it ought to be said that the purpose is not to utterly abolish war, but one that particularly concerns the relations subsisting between the great nations. We recognise that in the present stage of man's development armed force is necessary for the maintenance of society, and consequently for a good life. There are elements of lawlessness and disorder, both outside and within every State, which require force for their repression. An armed force properly stands for order and justice. To allow this, however, is not to acknowledge the necessity of armed forces as they now exist among the great nations, nor that war between these has a moral justification. The largeness of these forces, and their constant increase, is not due to the needs for the suppression of lawlessness, but to considerations of the possibility of conflict one with another. Thus the forces, whose true purpose is the maintenance of order and justice, are maintained with a view to use in a purpose which is a violation of justice. In so far as the armed forces of the civilised nations are used against each other are shaped with a view to such use, they are in opposition to the sole purpose which justifies their being. This is the evil. How have the nations come to this dilemma? It is a situation of natural growth. Each of these States represents an established Government maintaining that order and justice which is necessary for the well-being of a civilised society. Each is a growth: each has absorbed the many small societies and petty kingdoms which have in the past occupied the same area. Each, during this growth, has not only had to be on the guard against inimical forces within itself, but constantly against an hostile world without. Thus they stand, separate and on guard, at the point of time which men in this part of the world mark as 1906. The way of relief is obvious. It is by unity. All the nations that stand for order and justice should act in concert. Differences that occur between them ought never to be settled by the method of each interested party insisting on its own interpretation, but by appeal to justice.

The distinction implied in the existing treaties in the nature of the differences that rise between nations is real. There are differences relating to matters of fact, termed "juridical," and there are differences which rise from conflicting interests and policies. Between these two classes there is a radical difference; and agreement to submit differences of the latter kind to arbitration is quite another matter from agreement regarding the other kind only. The function of a Court dealing with differences of the first kind is to investigate the facts, and to give an award according to the finding. The only equitable and rational ground on which judgment could be based in the latter kind is the general well-being of mankind. The

function of a Court dealing with this class of dispute would be the regulating and controlling of living forces. It has to be acknowledged that such a Court would have a great power over the nations. The nations attaching to it would surrender control of their external policy, and would come into different relation to each other.

It is on this ground that objections will be based. The subjecting of the nation to the control of an outside authority will, in itself, as a surrender of independence, be raised as an objection sufficient to disqualify the scheme. To regard nations as isolated entities is fallacious. Absolute independence exists only in the imagination. There is no European nation that has not derived the greater part of all that makes it what it is from foreign sources. All that is good in the lives of these nations has been contributed to by each. Take any one of them, look at its industry, its arts, and even the thoughts of its people, and then imagine what it would be if all that can be traced as having come from outside sources, only during the last thousand years, were to be taken away. The whole structure collapses. Mankind is one. When men talk of their nation's independence, it is important to keep this truth in mind. But what the objecting ones have in mind, when they speak of independence, is absolute freedom of the nation from control by any authority outside itself. They say this freedom from control is essential for the preservation of our "rights." They speak of our "rights" as of something particularly ours, as certain special privileges. But the idea is utterly fallacious. We have no such rights. Ask those who speak about the necessity of defending our "rights" what they mean, and what rational answer can they give? To these objectors we have to put the question: Do they wish our nation to domineer in the world and force its will on other peoples, or do they wish other peoples to be treated considerately and dealt with justly? To say that they all do desire other nations to be treated justly would be more optimistic than true. But there are, perhaps, few among them who would not say they wish justice to be done, and who do not believe that they wish it. If they mean anything rational when they speak of our "rights," it is that they wish right and justice to be done. But they see only one side of the matter: they are thinking of preventing ourselves from being wronged, and not at all about securing other nations against wrong from us. Having allowed that they wish justice to be done, we question the objectors further. How is a just settlement to be arrived at when a difference occurs between two parties, whether men or nations? There is only one way. It is to submit the matter, and to submit it without reserve, to a capable third party for decision. The man who refuses to do this is in opposition to justice. The position of one professing a desire for justice and refusing to do this is absurd. The insisting by any man on his

own interpretation of a dispute is partiality, while justice consists in *im*partiality. The essence of justice is the submission of selfish desires to the larger considerations of the general good. If men were to act to this principle—or rather want of principle—in their private affairs, society would be impossible. A man of good sense who has a dispute with another will never, even if he be absolutely certain that he is in the right, refuse to submit it for settlement to a properly constituted authority; because he knows that all men feel sure they are right when in a dispute, though they are nearly all in some degree mistaken, and because he will see that if they refused to take this course they could not live a good life together. The verdict may go against him—judges not being infallible—but he knows it is better to submit to it than to gain what he claimed by violent means. Consideration for others, tolerance and forbearance are virtues. Self-assertion is anti-social and immoral, and the mark of a shallow and narrow mind. And morality is the same for nations as for individuals. That which is wrong in the single man is not less wrong in the nation. The demand which is made on the man to conform to the good life of society, calls with equal force on every nation to conform to the good life of mankind.

The truth of this argument cannot be questioned. There is no way of escape from the position. The man who wishes to have justice done between the nations must allow that the only way to get it is by their placing all differences for settlement with an independent judicial authority. Some of the objectors, while allowing the truth of this argument, as a theory, will say that it would not succeed in practice, because we cannot get a perfect judicial authority. If there is any reason in this argument, it applies with equal force to the settlement of differences between individuals. All judges are more or less partial, and liable to give erring judgments. Shall it be said, therefore, that it is better for men to settle their private differences by the assertion of force than by appeal to justice? It may be said, however, that there is no authority, either existing or to be found, standing in the same disinterested and independent relation to the nations as does a judge to individual disputants, and consequently disputes between nations could not be settled so satisfactorily. This is only another way of expressing that traditional view, which, existing as a prejudice, is the source of all these objections, that all other peoples are inherently hostile to us. To regard all men of other nations as devoid of justice, is as senseless as it would be to regard them all as saints. It happens, however, that this matter is beyond the theoretical stage. The successful issue of the many differences between nations which have been referred to arbitration during the last fifty years proves the groundless nature of this objection. And perhaps it may be possible to form a better international

judicial authority than those used on these occasions. The impossibility of our having differences determined by an exact and perfect rule is not important; but that we settle them judicially, by use of the best means we have, is of supreme importance. The principle involved affects in the deepest way the wellbeing of man.

It is implied in the text of the existing treaties that, besides independence, the "vital interests" and the "honour" of a nation would be endangered by committal without reservation to arbitration. If the foregoing argument is worth anything, it proves that the thorough acceptance of arbitration is required by justice, and would be the best course for us. If this be true, it is absurd to suppose that it can ever clash with our vital interests. It is perhaps most reasonable to suppose that this term has been used as providing an excuse, whenever one may be desired, for a refusal to submit a difference to the Arbitration Court. And how can our honour be jeopardised by appeal to justice? Only by taking honour to mean loyalty to that conception of conduct that requires a man to personally furnish pain to any other who may offend him. Can this code conception of honour, based on a brutish plane of feeling and thought, be taken to guide our nation? Our average citizen is far beyond this. True honour requires one to act the noblest part, and calls for the strictest loyalty to justice.

To make resort to arbitration by the nations a success, there should be a capable, impartial, and stable judicial authority. It is the fact that no such reliable authority exists that makes statemen shy of arbitration. But the nations have not yet made an intelligent attempt to form such an authority. The personnel of the Arbitration Court ought to have permanent existence, and not be subject to the choice of the disputants, as is the method with the Court at the Hague, since such choice inclines to partiality. Each contracting nation should choose a man, or more if necessary, as a member of the Court. When arranging the scheme, the representatives of the nations should solemnly pledge their respective governments and peoples to select a man with the single purpose of securing high character, capacity, and impartiality. It should be agreed that the men elected shall each renounce the special claim which his nation has on him, and shall by his election enter into membership of all the contracting nations, and that thenceforward to the end of their lives their bond and obligation shall be to all these nations alike. Each man elected should be required to make a solemn pledge to do his utmost to free himself from the influence of party interests, and to make it his sole regard to promote the well-being of the nations by the impartial and wise conduct of the Court. A neutral language should be chosen for the

official use of the Court. The spreading use of Esperanto in several nations in recent years proves that such a language, suitable for all purposes, can be acquired without great difficulty. Each contracting nation should bind itself to submit to the Court every matter of difference between it and the other contracting nations which they fail to settle diplomatically; and they should agree to jointly maintain the Court's authority. The Court would have no authority over the internal affairs of any nation. Its sole function would be to give awards in matters of difference submitted to it. The territorial position of the contracting nations should be recognised as unalterable, and not to be called in question. While the contracting nations would be bound to submit to the Arbitration Court's decision in all matters placed with it, the standing of the Court would be only that of an instrument of these nations, subject to their control, to be modified and reformed by them as circumstances may show the need.

Which nations should be invited to join in this scheme? A little consideration makes it clear that all cannot be invited to join: there must be qualifications. It is essential to its success that the members of the Arbitration Court be men of high character, broad mind, and world-wide knowledge. Only by assurance that the Court will be formed of men of this character can the great nations, who are chiefly concerned, have confidence in it. Is it not likely that the men who would be elected by many of the small nations, if they were invited to join, would fail to reach this standard? Then let the great military nations form the scheme among themselves. It could be started by any two of these, if the others should be unwilling to join at first. The purpose of this exclusion, be it understood, is simply to limit the power of control of the Arbitration Court, and the right of election of arbiters; it is not in the least to prevent the excluded nations from resorting to arbitration.

We have before us an evil of the gravest nature. Is not this the way by which we can overcome it? If we do not shape such a scheme, it will not be because it cannot be done, nor because we can give a good reason why we should not try to do it; it will be from timidity and sheer mental incapacity to raise ourselves from the old trodden round, and follow the guidance of reason in adjusting ourselves to better conditions. The order of the world does not depend entirely on our will, however. Human society tends to unity; and the change is constantly going on, regardless of what governments do or fail to do. That aggregating influence which has formed the great States does not cease its activity. Between the peoples of Europe of to-day and their ancestors of a hundred years ago there is a great difference. There has been a great change in view of life and in feeling toward other nations. There

is now a far higher average general knowledge of life and the world; there is a more friendly regard of foreign peoples; and there is a different attitude toward war. On the other side of the Atlantic is a great State that takes in people from all the European nations; and there men dwell as neighbours who, had they remained in Europe, might have been compelled by their respective Governments to go and shoot each other. This and other factors have wrought a great change during the last century. There is a general dissatisfaction with the present military position of the nations. In every great military nation the number of people who oppose war is rapidly growing: and the more intelligent section of the labouring people have seen that their interests are alike in all nations, and they have denounced war. International congresses, political and industrial, are now of common occurrence. Groups of workmen, of doctors, journalists, city councillors, and scholars now visit other nations, and are received with the utmost cordiality, and even with enthusiasm; and there now exists a body composed of members of the parliaments of all nations with the purpose of promoting peace. Are not these things significant?

The time is ripe. To unite the nations in justice, needs only the sense to see the way and the will to take it. The eternal Sphinx is putting to us one of her silent questions. What is the answer to be?

HARRY HODGSON.

EDUCATION AND ETHICS.

THAT the actions of the individual often fall short of his ideals is a barren truism, but that the ethical standard of a community is generally lower than that of the individuals who compose it, is a fact which may not be so easily recognised. And yet we habitually observe that men in the mass are capable of deeds at which they would severally shrink. Whether it be in the great game of nations, where diplomacy and skill are often the merest euphemisms for trickery and deceit, or on the humbler stage of party warfare, where insincerity is often the readiest weapon, we see how frequently the man in private life is superior to the same man in his capacity as member of a party, or a society, or a state.

This is particularly true in the case of a community of boys. The force of example and the influence of tradition are stronger in childhood than at a more mature age, and characters take more readily the impress of the common mould. The standard of behaviour to which a boy conforms is in many cases one which, if left to himself, he would rise superior to, for what he hates more than anything else is to be singular. He would rather forego his dearest convictions, break away from his most cherished habits and sacrifice his keenest desires, than do anything unusual or wander a foot pace away from the path which public opinion directs him to follow. Just as this unwritten law of childhood is more tyrannous than those of later life, so is it more primitive; it adumbrates an earlier stage in man's existence, conforming in its character to the restrictions devised to safeguard an uncivilised society.

It is an essential preliminary to the practice of education that we should understand the character of those who are to be educated, and, in dealing with children, we must take into consideration the childish point of view. It is as absurd to regard a child as an angelic visitant, "trailing clouds of glory," as to see in it an incarnation of original sin. Children have acuter sympathies than their elders; the cruelty which they sometimes show is due to the lack of understanding, and their destructiveness is often merely an ebullition of the joy of living. Their greater liveliness of feeling is the source of many amiable qualities. On the other hand, it is useless to deny that there are many sins to which children are naturally prone. It is natural for them to conceal the truth if there is anything to lose by revealing it; a lie is the obvious refuge of the

weak, and the usual preventative is simply the fear of being found out. But it is also natural that they should love those who are kind to them; it is one thing to deceive your enemy and quite another to deceive your friend. To do the latter is unfair, and does not come within the rules of game. The boys did not tell lies to a famous headmaster because he always believed them. Again, the collective wisdom of "grown-ups" has decided that "marks" should be given as a stimulus to learning, the competitive instinct being at the root of all human effort. Accordingly, the ingenuous child comes to regard "marks" as the one and only object to strive for, and who can wonder if he steals them? Theft, of course, is one of the most criminal actions in a rude society, where the stolen property belongs to a fellow-member, but marks are regarded as the property of the teacher, and the teacher is beyond the pale. After all, "men are but children of a larger growth;" sentiments are occasionally enunciated by respectable grown-up people, where native states are concerned, which do not seem to differ so widely from the unspoken reasoning of the child. Moreover, in childish ethics, to borrow another boy's exercise and copy it word for word would be reprehensible (as well as foolish); it is advisable to insert a few mistakes so that the worker may get a few more marks than the idler, and receive the prize which his labour deserves; but we never yet heard of a gentleman on the Stock Exchange who was deterred by any such scruple in the case of a rival investor. It is by taking advantage of this *esprit de corps* that the teacher can get at the heart of many mysteries. A threat to punish the whole class if a culprit does not "own up," generally elicits a confession; if not, you may be sure that in a quiet and perfectly unostentatious manner he will receive more than his due meed of retribution. The danger underlying this state of affairs is that what common opinion receives as right and wrong may not be in accordance with the dictates of humanity and justice. Great abuses may be hidden through the prevalence of public spirit; innocence may be destroyed and cruelty thrive unchecked beneath the ægis of a traditional reticence. The remedy lies in a stronger bond of sympathy between young and old, though here again the difficulties are many and the demands are great: *quis custodiet ipsos custodes.*

Not even the greatest enthusiast for our modern system of education would declare that we have attained therein perfection, and a cynical spectator might object that it largely consists of a process of "make-believe." An eminent inspector was lately examining an elementary school in arithmetic. The papers were remarkable for the nice way in which lines were neatly ruled in every possible space, and for every possible, and impossible, reason. Great beauty was added to the productions by the employment of divers coloured inks—one may mention that it was a girls' school. One

pupil wrote down an addition sum in black, drew the lines carefully in red, and put down the answer (which was wrong) in some third colour: I believe it was green. Certainly the same amount of care spent in the working of the sum would have ensured a correct result, though the effect might not have been so pretty. The example is trivial, but it illustrates a certain inclination to sacrifice truth to appearances, which is characteristic of modern methods. Examinations have their drawbacks, but it is inspection which fosters the shop-window tendency.

A more serious piece of make-believe is the assumption of knowledge which some teachers make in order to hide a more or less excusable ignorance. The pedagogue cannot know all subjects equally well, and he may often find himself posed by a question relating to some department of knowledge which he has not studied. A man who had taken a high degree in modern languages once found himself in temporary charge of a mathematical division. A small boy, who was in difficulties over a sum, asked him how to multiply by five-and-a-half. Unfortunately the teacher, who had not multiplied by five-and-a-half since the days of his infancy, had forgotten the way to do it. However, he rose to the occasion. "Go to your place, my boy, you ought to know: if I told you, it would not be fair to the others." The child retired, abashed. After a decent interval the pedagogue looked up the answer to the sum, walked round the room till he found a boy who had got it correct, and inspected his method of doing it. Thus enlightened, he proceeded to the former boy, who was still puzzling his brains over the problem. "Well, have you found out how to multiply by five-and-a-half yet?" "No, sir, I can't do it." "Very well" (with an an assumption of great benevolence), "now I will show you." Comment is needless. The elaborate precautions which some teachers take, lest they should be suspected of not being omniscient, are quite unnecessary. Occasionally to admit one's ignorance need never be detrimental to respect; on the contrary, it is rather beneficial: it gives rise to fellow-feeling.

The ethical sense of the child is one thing, the ethical code of the man is another, and the system of morals which he professes, officially, is very often a third. The office of teacher is one which should be invested with a certain sanctity; it requires earnestness of purpose and self-sacrificing devotion in an unusual degree; it demands a steadfast adherence to duty and a tactful discrimination of character; but, above all, it needs the possession of a high ideal. Of what use is the man who teaches things which he does not believe in, who utters formulas which to him are meaningless, and who grinds away at lessons which in his heart he regards as barren of any beneficial result? And, it may be added, of what use is a great

deal which passes for education? For although people talk much nowadays about education, and seem to have very strenuous views on what they are pleased to call the religious side of it, it does not appear that many of them have any clear notion of the use of it at all. In a vague way, perhaps, they regard education as a training of the child to fulfil the duties of citizenship, to become an excellent man like his father most likely; but as to what these duties exactly are, and in what sense education is a preparation for them, opinions differ. Of the theory which requires the so-called commercial or money-making subjects to form the major part of the curriculum, it is unnecessary to speak at length. "The world and its ways have a certain worth," and it is good that a child should be equipped for the struggle of existence; but early specialisation is not, in the long run, the best way or the quickest. The subjects which have a direct monetary value are generally those which can be safely left to take care of themselves. At the same time, the conditions of life are always changing, and it is a poor argument that a system of study is good enough for us because it suited our ancestors. The relative value of the objects of study is not constant. It is clear that Latin is of less use to-day than it was when modern literatures were in their infancy, and when every scientific work was written in this tongue; and it is clear that the spread of commerce, and the closer international relations which accompany it, make modern languages more necessary than they were a hundred years ago. But what is often lost sight of is that the school is just as much a place for learning how to play as for learning how to work. After all, the really important part of a man's life is the time he devotes to leisure. Just as a nation goes to war presumably in order that it may have peace, so a man labours to rest rather than rests to labour. What he does with himself in the hours of ease is at least as important to himself and to society as the trade he earns his living by. Is the body of all importance and the soul of none? Apollo must serve Admetus, but he is still Apollo, and he is chiefly admirable not as the herdsman, but the god. That a man should employ his leisure wisely and beautifully is as great a matter of concern as that he should do his work honourably and bravely. School must be a preparation for both. One of the main objects of education is to open out numerous tracks which may be pursued with pleasure and with profit in the time to come. Vistas of untravelled land and distant prospects appear before the traveller. To give him the perception of those delights which cannot be won by self-indulgence, and ears to hear that harmony which grows from order and obedience to law; to bring him nearer to the heart of beauty, and bestow on him the power which is the fruit of knowledge: these are some of the aims and efforts of "a complete and generous" education.

The thing learned is not of so much importance as the way it is learned. Ignorant people are sometimes heard to remark that if a subject is forgotten, the time spent in learning it has been wasted. But certain habits have been formed in learning it, and these are not forgotten. New ideas have been acquired, and these are not wasted. The man who has learnt ever so little of a foreign language has been in touch with people who think more or less differently from those who speak his own. The benefit which accrues to him is that of the visitor to a strange country; he loses something of his petty isolation and provincial narrowness by contact with the foreigner. Still more is this the case where the language is that of a great nation whose outlook upon life is widely different from his own—of the Roman or the Greek. And in science, for instance, the most elementary experiment is a training in observation which is not lost, though the experiment may have little direct relation to the problem of bread-winning. In mathematics, again, although the precise significance of *sine* and *cosine* fade from the mind, it has benefited in a degree by the comprehension of an abstract truth. In their more advanced stages the utility of these studies is obvious, but even in their elements they are not without advantage.

From the angry controversy which is aroused by Education Bills it would appear that a peculiar influence is supposed to radiate from "Scripture" lessons. It is curious how easily men forget what they were like as children. It was once the fate of the writer to listen daily to a series of admirably learned dissertations from an archididascalian pulpit, effusions which had every merit save that of interesting the juvenile audience. It was pathetic to watch the expression of two hundred faces in various degrees of vacant indifference and inattention. Really, some people have no sense of humour! Either every lesson is religiously instructive or none is. A teacher exercises his influence by what he is rather than by what he says, and not the learning of any number of creeds, nor the most exact knowledge of the genealogy of the kings of Israel (albeit useful in examinations) is comparable in effect to the influence of those lessons which are drawn naturally and inevitably from the teacher himself. Notwithstanding, there are occasions where the routine admits of, and even requires, some direct moral teaching. An instance of this was furnished at a school one day, when, instead of the porter who usually came to each class-room to take the names of the absentees, there appeared an old man who used to do odds jobs about the place, and who was manifestly nervous in his new office. A few boys smiled and one laughed as he passed out of the room. The teacher quietly waited for a moment, and then told without comment the story of the Spartan envoys who, in the crowded theatre at Athens, rose from their seat of honour to make room for an old man who was vainly seeking a place, whereupon

the Athenians all stood up and applauded the action. It was better than many "pi-jaws."

It is by appealing to the imagination that an ethical influence can be exerted with greatest efficacy. Hence the object which the author of the *Faerie Queen* set before himself was "to fashion a gentleman or noble person in virtuous and gentle discipline." And for a similar reason Sir Philip Sidney, believing "the end of all earthly learning" to be "virtuous action," commended poetry as being "most fit to awake the thoughts from the sleep of idleness to embrace honourable enterprises." It is in this respect that the study of literature is most praiseworthy. Other pursuits may be more powerful agents in sharpening the intellect, but no other can be so effectual in humanising the character. The influence of history is of the same nature. Resting, as it does, on the fundamental curiosity which a man feels about the past, it leads him by degrees to the perception of a mighty series of causes and effects, it lifts him out of the present to a vantage point from which he may survey the laws of growth and decay in nations, and, by enlarging his horizon, it furnishes him with a wider realisation of life. The teachers of literature and history have perhaps an advantage over others in that their lessons afford so many opportunities for instilling large conceptions. But every subject may be made, more or less, into an instrument for education as well as instruction: that is, for developing and strengthening the mind in all its faculties, and leading it to the apprehension and the practice of the beautiful.

ARNOLD SMITH.

FRANZ JOSEPH GALL AND THE "SCIENCE" OF PHRENOLOGY

On one occasion—somewhere in the fall of the last century—Mr. John Morley defined, with characteristic lucidity and precision, the existing status of Phrenology among the "sciences," as defined by the recognised leaders of thought in Great Britain at that date: "To accept phrenology in these days stamps a man as unscientific." It is perfectly true that the results of Gall's life-long researches and observations, after undergoing the modifying culture of his self-elected successors, Spurzheim and Combe, and the progressive devolutionary development which they underwent from the effects of the continuous care of blatant quacks and shameless charlatans, soon came to acquire an odorus reputation, which absolutely excluded the patronage—and even the passing recognition—of all "scientists" who felt any anxiety for the orthodox respectability of their reputation. The waning years of the past century, and the opening ones of the present, have displayed a biographical feature of considerable prominence in their tendency to the white-washing of dusky reputations. Machiavelli, Lucrezia Borgia (and her brother Cæsar), Mary Queen of Scots, Henry VIII., Cromwell, Napoleon, and various others, have had many of the largest items of incriminating evidence, that were registered in their disfavour by contemporaries and immediate posterity, neutralised or even completely reversed; and, in every instance, modified more or less favourably. Within the past few years, Dr. Bernard Hollander has brought the case of Gall and the "science" of phrenology into the Court of Scientific Appeal, and displayed his willingness to defend against all comers the validity of the claims of the original cartologist of cranial topography, with its associated localisation of cerebral function. And now Mr. Stephen Paget, a surgeon of deservedly high reputation in his profession, and possessed of the additional accomplishments of exceptional literary abilities and acquirements, has applied for a summary and final dismissal of the claims of phrenology on scientific recognition; with an absolute injunction against the occupation of a niche in any part of the scientific temple of fame by the effigy of its reputed founder. Mr. Paget's views must, of course, secure wide-spread attention—from his well-known attainments. Most of his state-

ments and arguments have, I think, been advanced before—by those who were unable to enforce them with the combination of literary momentum and scientific precision of which he is a recognised master. And here I cannot refrain from remarking, with regret, that these latter gifts seem to tend to become proportionally more rare among the ranks of the practitioners of the healing art, as the broadcast diffusion of convenient mechanical methods and appliances, with superficial physical knowledge, renders the acquisition of a "passable" amount of so-called "practical science" so much more readily attainable by the proprietor of the average modicum of intellect. I would also indicate in passing, another regrettable feature of the intellectual march of this progressive generation: the *unacknowledged* neglect of the logical faculty and method in the "scientific" researches and discussions with which our eyes and ears are every day assailed. Some observant individual has remarked before now that logic is the one form of reasoning which men do *not* employ in everyday life. This statement is, I believe, uncontradictable. But it is not the less true that if the syllogistic test had been periodically applied to the "scientific" theories and "facts" and "proofs" which have filled the intellectual atmosphere during the past half century, suffering humanity would have been saved from the effects of many broad inundations of preposterous—and often mischievous —"practical" applications of the same, which have been successfully floated on the intellectual—and thence on the financial—market. And earnest observers and thinkers would have often escaped the depressing contemplation of the scientific bounce and the malvolionic self-appreciation of so many contemporaries who have managed to secure a reception within the inner circle of the elected representatives of materialistic knowledge, as well as of the aggravating conceit of the members of the extra-circumferential zone of aspiring candidates and on-hangers who form the chromosphere of the central illuminating mass of scientific light and revelation.

Mr. Paget brings to the task of demolition of the claims of a miscalled "science" the accomplishments of an observant traveller, as well as those of a scientific authority, and of a literary expert. As a skilled practitioner of the healing art, he has (necessarily cultivated the faculty of scrutinising men and women—divested of the masks and screens provided by the dissimulation of ordinary existence—to a degree at which members of any other calling have seldom or never an opportunity of arriving. So that, from every point of view, his expert evidence demands respectful attention. And his "expert" opinion of Gall and his "science" is a very low one, indeed—far below the zero level on the standard test! He tells us that the original cerebral topographer:

"went the wrong way to work and never retraced his steps; he was the slave of one idea, the victim of the deductive method. In a word, he was not a man of science. . . . He had not the spirit, he would not follow in the way of science; his whole stock-in-trade, when he started, was the one wild guess that he would find man's instincts, faculties, and passions limited to distinct regional areas on the surface of man's skull—and, of course, he found them. He was dominated and hag-ridden by this fixed idea till he dropped."

We find the above, and very many more of such, scorching sentences in the criticism which Mr. Paget contributed to the *Fortnightly Review* (December, 1905). The blows are suggestive of legendary memories of the hammer of Thor; after every impact of the missive it rebounds to the hand of its owner, whence it is instantaneously projected in the direction of another vulnerable point. And every blow is administered with the ease and grace which so distinctively characterise to exertions of the athlete. Such a combination of qualifications and powers in a scientific duellist inevitably inspires a combination of awe and admiration.

The writer of the present article having, however, been long infected with the weakness of a considerable admiration for the personality and life-work of Franz Joseph Gall, feels constrained to raise his feeble voice in defence of the teacher who is no longer in a position to defend his own doctrines. Possibly the characteristic racial bias of the Hibernian Celt, which leads him to be always "agin the government," and evermore sceptical and critical regarding the pretensions and guiding principles of the presiding powers of the period—whether political or scientific—has led to the development of this feature (or "bump"?) of mental perversity, and to the persistent colouration of his heretical views with a subjective zone of hoplessly abnormal illumination. The intelligent —and unbiassed—reader will, I trust, be able to judge. Whatever direction the ultimate decision may take, Mr. Paget does not seem to me to have done to the methods and achievements of the "founder of phrenology" the unstinted (and untinted) justice which I was prepared to expect from a scientific critic of his exceptional attainments and brilliant past record. He opens his discussion of Gall and phrenology with a sparkling aphorism of the witty and learned—as well as politic and philosophic—Mme. de Stael, which asserts the spirally continuous ascent of human progress. The saying is, of course, familiar to all readers. It is decidedly clever, optimistically philosophical, brilliantly fanciful, excessively feminine, and superlatively French! With fewer attractive qualities, many aphoristic enunciations have, in course of time, come to be established as items of inspired truth; which would not have survived their birth for a single hour, if directly subjected to the dialectic method of penetrating scrutiny by means of which Socrates successfully punctured every bubble of opinion that was blown in his

presence. And a verbal item of such gaseous consistency I unhesitatingly pronounce to be that graceful Gallic version of the progressive purification of the pardonable human soul, in its purgatorial pilgrimage to the Eden summit, from which it was privileged to spring on its etherial flight to the regions of unchanging perfection and celestial beatitude.

Mr. Paget next proceeds to the introduction of another fascinating simile—presumably original. It is furnished by the tortuous ascent of the Wassen section of the St. Gothard railway; which he pronounces "the perfect illustration," "once and for all," of the words of Mme. de Stael. In the course of this ascent, according to the semi-poetic description now before the reader, "you"—among various gratifying experiences—"are withdrawn into an interminable [Hibernian] tunnel; the train swings upward and hangs circling and hovering over the village; and you come to Göschenen, and there, oh! happy traveller, happy past all telling, Italy welcomes you." (Some tourists have represented Switzerland welcoming at Göschenen the returning pilgrim of Italy, on his emergence from the great St. Gothard tunnel at its Helvetian extremity; and figured the Wassen railway curves as those of a hair-pin duplicated —in other words, of a letter S which has undergone vertical compression by having its head sat on. But a Baedeker is not handy at the moment of writing; and such merely geographical considerations may be summarily dismissed as of no logical importance, and even as an unwarrantable drag on the movements of poetic licence.) The application of the similitude, with the limitations thereof, are definitely indicated:

> "So, on the lines of thought, the spirit of man in its onward course leaves this or that problem below it, but not behind it; . . . the simile breaks down; for the spirit neither stops at Göschenen nor attains Italy. But Mme. de Stael's wise saying holds good; . . . This particular Wassen, that was once over the heads of thinking men, and is now contemplated by them from a far higher level, is Phrenology."

When the loftiest attainable—or attempted—position of ascent has been reached by the laborious and ambitious traveller, it is quite characteristically human that a chant of triumph should celebrate the event. And it is quite as human for the successful climber to forget in time the magnitude and importance, on the lower planes of his former pilgrimage, of the objects which no longer lie within the range of distinct vision. The "human understanding" is so extremely elusive a quantity that some very successful climbers of the slippery heights of science have had their internal sense of scientific perspective seriously disordered on reaching what they took for the summit of their intellectual ambition. The profound astronomer of the pages of *Rasselas* came to believe that his supervision was essential to the normal succession of the

seasons, and the owner of the most celebrated name in historic astronomy has bequeathed to posterity a record of almost comparable weakness in his efforts to reconcile mathematical chronology and secular science with Biblical history and dogmatic theology. A degree of self-appreciation, strictly comparable to that of Æsop's fly on the carriage-wheel, became conspicuously prominent in some instances; and, assuredly, underwent latent development in far greater numbers. In other instances, the triumphal chant has been more suggestively reminiscent of the chuckle of the wren on the eagle's back, on the occasion of having robbed the proud bird of Jove of his claim to the distinction of being, of all the inhabitants of the air, that which had approached nearest to the great luminary of the day. The æronaut of the scientific atmosphere is but too prone to forget that he is deprived of former opportunities of direct scrutiny, and that important history may be in process of evolution in the streets and homes of his Wassen, the value of which he can no more estimate when he is far above, than he could when far below, the standard level of its plane. He can continue to be an authority on matters thereto appertaining when kept continuously, and reliably, informed thereof by some system of (necessarily wireless) telegraphy—but only then.

Mr. Paget's contempt for the methods and results of Franz Joseph Gall, and for his recently attempted defence by Dr. Bernard Hollander, would almost seem to surpass the powers of verbal expression. They, and their performances, are relegated to the nadir of the sphere of cosmic knowledge; while the methods and possibilities of contemporary "science," with its mechanical precision and its microscopical accuracy, are made to mark the position of its zenith. Such unlimited depreciation and exaltation furnish, by themselves, sufficient reason to the sceptical and the cautious, who have come to know something of the fallibility of human opinion, to desire personal verification of the data on which such articles of scientific dogma have been so confidently based—and enunciated.

Proceeding from the optimistic philosophy of Mme. de Stael, through the "spiral" convolutions of the Wassen railway, Mr. Paget arrives at the station of Phrenology, where he at once collides with the recent volumes of Dr. Bernard Hollander, of which one "has this forbidding sub-title, 'The Revival of Phrenology.'" On the merits of this devoted tome we find an uncompromising judgment pronounced in the very next sentence: "In matters of style, and of self-criticism, it is well-nigh everything that such a book ought not to be; and if its doctrines are to get a hearing from men of science, he must re-write it after a very different fashion." Before proceeding with any comment of my own, I will take the opportunity of expressing the belief that a critic of Mr.

Paget's high attainments and refined tastes will agree with me that *flippancy* is not admissible in serious scientific discussion; that scientific *snobbery* is altogether out of keeping with the true spirit of mutually enlightening research; and that every display of *assumption of "scientific" superiority* must, in order to secure recognition in a community and age of democratic liberality and fair play, be founded on an unshakeable basis of mastery of the scientific data and opinions which its exhibitor may have elected to discuss.

Near the beginning of his paper Mr. Paget states, with regard to Dr. Hollander's volume, that "it suggests more than it knows. . . . In this respect Dr. Hollander's book is like the ordinary phrenological bust." Towards the end he tells us that the author "has no admiration of the shilling bust," and makes him an encouraging suggestion: "There is in his book abundant material for a good clinical essay; let him write that, and submit it to men who are good judges of the subject." The connotation implied in the epithet which figures in the last clause of this sentence may—probably will, indeed—be regarded by unprejudiced readers as equivocal. Any attempt to carry out the suggestion which it contains is by no means likely to succeed to the satisfaction of the parties interested. Dr. Hollander cannot very well be expected to agree with his opponents' selection of "good judges," and it is far more than probable that neither side would approve the nomination made by a mediating third party. The idea of such procedure recalls to the mental vision vivid imagery of the assumption of the elect members of the inner zone of twentieth-century science. Its suggestion, following closely on the high-toned announcement that poor Dr. Hollander, before he can get a hearing at all "*must* re-write," gives to the reader who had preconceived ideas of Mr. Paget's liberality, some disappointed surprise. Indeed, I can only account for it only by recollecting the fact that phrenology ("as she is taught") always proves, to the high-class "scientist," a specially irritating subject for discussion. But even twentieth-century scientists, as well as twentieth-century politicians, should keep before them the Divine suggestion, to "him that thinketh he standeth." It is hardly in keeping with the true spirit of progress to call up to the fretful fancy of the struggling amateur scientist visions of the knout of Russian censorship, and of the most efficient methods of application of the machinery of the Spanish Inquisition.

The *Klangfarbe* of Mr. Paget's enunciations becomes, perhaps, even more distinctive when conveyed in the penetrating tone of the following clauses:

"Phrenology would like to join in the procession; or, at least, to catch the eye of physiology. Phrenology is waiting in the gutter, as Falstaff, old, shaky, half-pride, half-shame, waits for recognition from the King—

'I will leer upon him, as 'a comes by; and do but mark the countenance that he will give me'; and we know what answer Falstaff got. . . . Phrenology, so long as it talks in this style, can receive but one answer from science; and it is the answer that the King, on the day of his coronation, flings at Falstaff, 'I know thee not.'"

There can be no question, I should say, of the quality of the *matter* which has emitted these opinions, or of the *spirit* which inspired them. Let me now invite the reader to glance at some facts bearing upon the association of the name of Gall with the subsequent practice of phrenology; they do not seem to have been very generally known ever since the construction of the "shilling bust."

The scornful critic of the charlatanism of the strolling phrenologist—with his digital scrutiny of cranial bumps, consequent evolution of character-sketches, and absorption of shilling fees—usually appears to be unaware of the fact that Gall made an indignant protest against the promulgation of the "science," of "phrenology" which was carried out by Spurzheim, his former pupil and assistant. This latter, who ordained himself the apostle of the doctrine of cranial bumps, left his master without ceremony, and proceeded to undertake the conversion of England, the most fructifying nursery of quacks and charlatans, with the well-founded hope of reaping a harvest for himself by an unprincipled—but satisfactorily lucrative—*mis*application of his master's researches and discoveries. Few, if any, of Gall's detractors betray any knowledge of the fact that he did more to advance the existing knowledge of the brain and central nervous system than all the other anatomists of his generation, to which we may gratuitously add, of all preceding generations. This statement will, pretty surely, appear at first sight to the general reader to conform to the Transatlantic conception of "a large order." But it, nevertheless, represents an unvarnished and very easily verifiable statement of an actual fact. When Franz Joseph Gall commenced his researches, the usually irregular and nearly always unsystematic methods of anatomical and physiological investigation, in the absence—practically complete—of all microscopical procedure, had left the knowledge of the central nervous system in great measure limited by the swaddling-clothes with which its infant form had been invested by Aristotle more than twenty centuries before. Since the publicatian of his colossal work, its contents have proved a veritable quarry—or mine—from which the *original* observations and *discoveries* of successive generations of anatomists have been diligently and successfully exhumed. The magnificent atlas which illustrates his four folio volumes of text contains no labelled bust; such decoration was developed by the artistic ingenuity of his absconded pupil, Spurzheim, and the correspondingly ambitious Combe. As a

typically enthusiastic genius, his restless pursuit of knowledge in his chosen domain never underwent relaxation. Like all such investigators, his ways and methods were frequently suggestive of the "faddist"; and the record of their progress is often amusing, as well as instructive. Mr. Paget refers to some, to which I intend to return. I will now refer to another, the process of his localisation of *destructiveness*. The defined position, as is well known, is above and behind the ear. Among the personages whose notable prominence in that region was observed by Gall to be associated with the moral feature in question, were three who appear to have specially fixed his attention. One of them had thrown up the business in which he had already made a promising start as a young man, to adopt that of a *butcher;* the second had attained the position of a successful and esteemed citizen when the post of public executioner became vacant, whereupon he astonished his acquaintances by his enthusiastic adoption of the profession of *hangman*; while the third example was of one who from childhood had been noted for demoniacal cruelty to all living things on which he could practise it with impunity, and on approaching man's estate would not be induced to take up any career or profession but that of a *surgeon!* (Readers should, of course, remember that this biographical event occurred long before the introduction of anæsthesia.) The display of such a triad of specimens of distinctive craniology and morality will tend to titillate the organs of risibility in the ignorant and sarcastic. To all such I would suggest the suppression of opinion till they have fully examined Gall's work. I have not yet had an opportunity of meeting any one who has done so. I have myself scrutinised them with considerable care; and feel rather inclined to suspect that many of the original discoverers of matters cerebral will not feel quite grateful to Dr. Hollander and Mr. Paget for making so much noise about them. It may have the effect of sending the curious to examine for themselves. And I can confidently promise all such, that when they do, they will find more startling—and immeasurably less equivocal—revelations regarding transference of authorship than any which have hitherto been brought to light in the course of the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy!

Mr. Paget would refer the origin of the process of "localisation" to the "great discoveries" to which "classical references" are to be found in the writings of Prochaska and of Sir Charles Bell—regarding store-houses of nerve force in the spinal cord, and the distinct motor and sensory functions of its two sets of nerve-roots. I do not think the suggestion by any means a happy one, either in space or in time. The functions referred to are not limited at all in the vertical direction. And Mistichelli had announced (in 1709) nearly a century before, the decussation of the fibres of the anterior

pyramids of the medulla oblongata; which was accepted as demonstrative of the regulation of the voluntary movements of either half of the body by the opposite hemisphere of the brain. I venture to think that most skilled critics will admit that this was a more definite "forecast" of cerebral localisation than the spinal functions discussed by Prochaska and by Bell—a century later. The curious will find many of Bell's best thoughts in Gall's first volume (1810): and the transplanting *discoverer* not only neglected to indicate the source of his originality, but had the callous audacity—combined with his Caledonian candour—to announce that Gall did not distinguish cerebellum from cerebrum! It is quite in keeping with one of the very worst chararteristics of fallen humanity that an aspirant to scientific originality should endeavour to safeguard the source of his information with a protecting atmosphere of malodorous reputation. The present writer has known "Professors" of the same nationality go and do likewise—and do it with their best vigour and pertinacity.

Mr. Paget indicates the subsequent landmarks—formed by the works of Marshall Hall, Flourens, Claude Bernard, and others; through which, according to his view, "physiology rose to the study of the brain itself. . . ." Here I will take the opportunity of pointing out to the reader that the functional "fact" of cerebral physiology, which holds the position next to the infallible, is the regulation of the movements of each side of the body by the opposite half of the brain. But let no candid inquirer lay the soothing unction to his scientific spirit that even so glaring an apparent fact may not be disputed. This has been—and by the most competent authority, Brown-Sequard, the foremost experimental physiologist of his generation—pointed out thirty years ago, that he had found that "a paralysis on the side injured always follows certain injuries of the surface of the brain"; and the observation of the apparent anomaly led him to the discovery of over two hundred cases of paralysis of the human body, reported by competent observers, in all of which the central cause was some disease or injury of the same side of the brain. As the strength of every chain is that of its weakest link, such facts may be commended to confident "localisers" of the present day. And in passing them on, I will just take the opportunity of remarking that as the "deductive" method long formed the plague inhibitory of scientific development, enforced as it was by the cast-iron limitations of authority, so the free pathways of the "inductive" method tend to lead, ultimately, to the self-approving conclusions of that form of reasoning which has been ungallantly termed "ladies' logic." How very much the processes of the latter are in keeping with the prevailing mental methods of the opening years of the twentieth century, must be but too painfully evident to every earnest thinker, as he observes the continuous penny-in-the-slot supply of

intellectual pabulum—always thoroughly peptonised, to save the exhausting exercise of cerebral digestion, before being placed in the delivery machine—for immediate convenience of all comers, of either sex and of every age.

The lofty disdain of the occupant of the supra-Wassen station, as he surveys the position of the phrenological Falstaff "waiting in the gutter," represents, it should seem, the acme of scientific gratification. Accordingly, I would suggest the consideration of a few facts arranged on the opposite side of the pyramidal slope. I venture to think that an assumption that the general reader is not familiar with Gall's great work involves no error of more than microscopic dimensions. Accordingly, I will point out to him that Gall was not the sculptor of the phrenological bust—the production of his runaway assistant Spurzheim; and ask him to realise the fact that he was not the actual "founder of phrenology"—in the sense of the popular connotation. I will now call attention to two—only—of the more conspicuous results of Gall's untiring researches. It is well recognised that the motor centres of the human brain are more (approximately) definable than those of the intellectual powers—perhaps from the fact of the latter being of less general and more recent development. But it must be stated, nevertheless, that even the motor centres are not pigeon-holed in water-tight compartments. Geometrical limitations of conduction are by no means demonstrable. And the present writer, for one, finds it difficult to realise how any intelligent observer, who *knows* the microscopic structure of the cerebral cortex, could for a moment conceive that the exercise of any such specific functions would be at all likely to be rigidly confined to a clearly limitable area. The possibilities of "shunting" and "short-circuiting," with associated development of "vicarious action," are suggested by every unit of its structure. That such re-arrangements do occur is very well known to every competent clinical observer. And, as a mere matter of fact, there exists, up to present date, but *one* centre the specialisation of whose function is defined with anything at all approaching the sanctity of exclusive consecration. That is the *speech*-centre! And the discovery of that centre is wholly and solely due to Franz Joseph Gall!! A specially illustrative item of the utter irony of scientific reputation is offered in the fact that this cortical area is generally known to anatomical posterity as "Broca's space." The latter "authority" had been one of the noisiest opponents of Gall's published view of the function of this cortical area, till he saw a *single* autopsy, which offered startling confirmation of its accuracy; and the revelation had the telling result that, as a green convert, he became at once so explosive an advocate of the new article of physiological faith that his name clung to the centre like an adhesive label!

Every anatomical student has to face the horrors of mastering the

labyrinthine ways of the fifth cranial nerve, the veritable *pons asinorum* of the medical curriculum. And every human being—lay and medical—is at times made to feel the inconvenience of its functional activity; for on this depends all personal experience of toothache and facial neuralgia, as well as all other sensations connected with the face and its immediate vicinity. All the great anatomists, from Andreas Vesalius to John Hunter, had seen the trunk fibres of this terrible structure spring from the lateral margin of the pons Varolii, below the surface of which they failed to trace it—if they ever made a good effort in way of trying. The untiring industry with which Franz Joseph Gall was so "dominated and hag-ridden" throughout his whole career, enabled him (aided by the collateral illumination afforded by his researches in comparative anatomy) to trace without the aid of the microscope, the roots of this most complex of all the structures of the human frame, to the lower part of the medulla oblongata—where the twentieth century anatomist, furnished with the newest staining re-agents, and the most magnifying microscopes, is obliged to leave them still growing! As a mere—uncontradictable—fact in the history of scientific progress, these two discoveries have formed the generating foci around which the entire expanding mass of our knowledge of the physiological anatomy of the brain has since grown, with what approximate geometrical regularity of outline it can be held to possess. These are the prominent twin specimens of many hundreds of Gall's discoveries, which have since made the fame of so many *original* explorers in the arcana of the cerebral centres. And after all, as human nature unhappily still remains in an unregenerate state, there is but little reason for surprise that the great pioneers of mental and neural science have united in a conspiracy of contemptuous silence, alternating with derisive detraction, regarding the work of the misrepresented "founder of phrenology."

The phrenology of Franz Joseph Gall was an attempt to present, on the basis of physiology, the facts—as he regarded them—which he had gleaned in the most elevated department of the *Physiognomia humana* of Aristotle and of Baptista Porta. The present writer admits his belief in the significance of the external conformation of the human frame in its various regions—with all appurtenances thereof, from the cranio-facial bumps, feature, and hirsute appendages down to the ungual decorations of the fingers and toes—if the latter have not been distorted by their coverings. And he has never met with an observant person whose opinion was not greatly influenced by "first impressions"—however unconsciously so. The voluntary movements have all their graphic significance; and to the scientific scoffer at such infantile conceptions may be commended some passing consideration of an aphorism whose accuracy of indi-

cation has never, I believe, been successfully disputed. "Beware of the man whom dogs and children avoid."

In drawing to a close, I would pause to consider two of Gall's cranial "bumps." (They have been noticed in Mr. Paget's paper.) The first proved his starting-post. He had noticed that those of his schoolfellows who led off at their lessons had prominent eyes. This he attributed to the encroachment on the orbital spaces by unusual development of the anterior segments of the cerebral hemispheres. This suggested the localisation of *memory*. Mr. Paget states that: "It is doubtful whether any young man ever made a worse start," and then proceeds to some remarks which it is not quite pleasant to me to criticise in the way which truth and justice demand: "Regardless of all other possible causes, as the orbital fat, the size of the eye-balls, and the width of space between the eyelids, he persuaded himself that the prominence of the eyes was due to the quantity of brain above the orbits; . . ." I had already heard of—and read of—these various objections to Gall's view, and no clearer proof can be furnished to a skilled observer of the immeasurable superiority of Gall's anatomy to that of his industrious detractors. Indeed, I can account for their adoption by a critic of Mr. Paget's professional attainments only by consideration of the fact that he, like his favourite Homer, "sometimes nods." Asking the general reader to remember that we are considering parts in a healthy condition only—I beg to state that the amount of orbital fat *never* causes increased prominence of the eyes (please survey those of our over-weighted aldermen!) for watchful nature permits no accumulation there; that the "size of the eyeballs" *never* causes prominence, for it represents one of the few approximations to mathematical constancy in the macroscopic anatomy of the human body; and that the "width of space between the eyelids" *never* modifies, even to the extent of a hair's breadth, the antero-posterior projection—that is to say, the prominence—of the eyes. And I will take the liberty of suggesting to Mr. Paget that before allowing this article of his scientific faith—negative as it essentially is—to solidify into hopeless rigidity, he should ascertain the collective observations of a number of experienced schoolmasters. Gall's statement vividly recalls a schoolboy reminiscence of the present writer. At the roadside National School (of a West of Ireland parish), where he received his very rudimentary early education, there was one boy who left all competitors nowhere; and the bilious feelings of the more envious invariably found vent in the application of the depreciative epithets of "bullet-eyes" and "saucer-eyes." And to the present day his experience of the significance of a certain type of ocular prominence remains the same.

The vertical position of the bump of *veneration* owed its genesis

to the observation of the heads of the ultra-devout. Such methods, and the deductions therefrom, are, of course, scouted by Mr. Paget as almost beneath the scorn of a critic who is duly inflated with the "spirit of science" of the present generation. Yet I would suggest to readers and critics, whose opinions have not been allowed to settle into the fossil condition, that the owner of a well-arched bregmatic elevation is more than likely to be an aspirant to high ideals—and an eager pursuer of the same, so far as that unspiritual Deity, "Circumstance," will permit him to be. In this connection I would suggest to Mr. Paget a sympathetic glance at the busts of Sir Walter Scott and Sir Thomas Watson, whose loftiness of idea and endeavour, in their respective pursuits, can never be challenged. On the other hand, I will make bold to state, without mentioning names or suggesting individuals, that the owner of a flat-roofed cranium, which becomes almost as wide behind the ears as it is long from before backwards, is a born scoundrel of the calculating type—the type which in Oriental conditions would develop into a successful Thug, and in those of Western civilisation into a highly respectable metropolitan attorney.

To me, the fate of Gall in his scientific pilgrimage has long been suggestive of the experiences of Lemuel Gulliver in his Lilliputian sojourn. And the articles of scientific impeachment, in the case of the former, *do* present such a distressful family resemblance to those of the political series of criminal practices which were drawn up in orthodox script by the lawyers and courtiers of the remote Island Empire, for the purpose of securing the conviction and banishment of the latter. And I venture to suggest that the key which unlocks the mystery in each case is to be found in the bitterly cynical aphorism—a too obvious reflection derived from personal experience—of the author of the immortal *Travels:* "Whenever a true genius appears in the world, you may always know him by this sign, that all the dunces are arrayed in confederacy against him." To the general reader it will probably appear a startling statement to find it asserted that Gall's work meant as much for the central nervous system as did Newton's for the solar system—and a great deal more. The most important astronomical data were ready to the hand of the latter long before he reduced them to an approximately harmonious system by the application of his hypothesis of gravitation; while it is well known to the initiated that this hypothesis may ultimately be shown to be as purely fanciful as Gall's suggestions of cerebral localisation—and a great deal more so. Let the microscopic scientist of the twentieth century by all means revel in the lightsome atmosphere of his supra-Wassen-ic position. Feather-headed as he sometimes is, he should not allow the giddiness of his elevation to exclude all recollection of the fact that this elevation prevents his observation of the persons and things by which contemporary history

is being made. And, in the name of truth and fairplay, let not his pride of place prevent him from doing something of justice to the personality and life-work of Franz Joseph Gall, who laid the foundations of our present knowledge of the central nervous system with immeasurably less assistance from the works of his predecessors than had Newton in the case of astronomy, Lavoisier in that of chemistry, or Faraday in that of elecricity.

JOHN KNOTT.

RUSSIA AND THE UNITED KINGDOM.[1]

I.

AT the present moment the great struggle in Russia of men and women alike for constitutional freedom arouses the warmest sympathy of all lovers of justice in these islands. There, the claims of the women to political justice and free citizenship have the earnest support of the Duma, equally with those of men; and as the Tsar has already assented to the free and equal citizenship of men and women in Finland, there can be little doubt as to the ultimate and not long-delayed free and equal citizenship of men and women in Russia.[2]

Meanwhile, in this country, women, who have been asking in vain for forty years past for political justice and the restitution of their earlier civic rights, have seen, during that period, the growth of the privileged male electorate from less than seven hundred thousand to more than seven millions, and with the near prospect of unrestricted "manhood" suffrage, find themselves still ranked politically with minors, lunatics, and felons—nay, in a worse position than any of these classes, since the minor may grow up, the felon may complete his sentence, the lunatic may have a lucid interval, during which our law holds him fully competent to vote, but the birth crime of sex remains in a woman inexpiable. Meanwhile, and as a direct consequence of this enforced disability, the shameful legal injustices from which women still suffer remain unredressed—the cruelty of the English law of marriage, as established in 1889 by thirteen judges (two dissenting); the infamous inequality in England of the law of divorce, and its practical denial to the poor; the absurdities and iniquities of the law of inheritance; the exclusion of women from the practice of the law, from seats in Parliament and on Town and County Councils; from almost all well-paid and dignified official posts, and from every position in which the mother voice might become a powerful factor for the "making" of the race—remain in full force.

The reforming impulse which restored to married women their

[1] *Serf Life in Russia: The Childhood of a Russian Grandmother.* By Alexandra de Holstein and Dora B. Montefiore. London: William Heinemann.
[2] *The Russian Peasantry.* By Stepniak. London: George Routledge & Sons.

ancient rights in their own property and earnings, and assured to married mothers the very limited rights they possess with regard to their own children, was long ago exhausted, and men talk now as if they marvelled at the astounding generosity of their predecessors in conceding these ameliorations of our unjust laws, and some would gladly undo them if they could. We seem indeed in danger, should Mr. John Burns remain in power, of seeing the Married Women's Property Act virtually repealed by the legal prohibition of married women from paid industrial work, although Mr. Burns suggests no way of providing for the maintenance of the mothers and children from whom he would take away their existing means of livelihood. Meanwhile, also, the introduction at the fag end of the Session of the "Dangerous Performances" Bill, with the apparent intention of rushing it through, a measure which would put the employment of thousands of women at the mercy of local magistrates, absolutely ignorant of the conditions with which they would have to deal; and this by a Ministry which will not concede that political enfranchisement of women to which 283 of its Party followers in the House of Commons are pledged, and which has not yet (July 5) found time to attempt to secure to women that right to eligibility to Borough and County Councils to which the Prime Minister and other Cabinet Ministers deeply pledged themselves whilst yet in opposition; all this shows us plainly that English women, no less than Russian men and women, live under a despotic rule, mitigated only by occasional faint gleams of common sense and political justice on the part of their despots.

The one hope of the women of this nation lies in the resolute will of women themselves to be free, and the readiness of English as well as of Russian women to face insult, imprisonment and, if need be, death itself to achieve their freedom, is to us, as to them, the one assurance that the days of this tyranny shall soon be overpast.

Of the two books dealing with the conditions of life in Russia which I commend to the readers of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW, the one entitled *Serf Life in Russia* is the joint work of two women, one English and one Russian, the latter the "Russian Grandmother," whose recollections of her childish days not merely picture to us vividly the life-conditions of the domestic serfs before the emancipation of February 19, 1861, but give us a profoundly interesting self-revelation of the thoughts and feelings of an intensely sensitive child nature, developed in the midst of those strange mediæval conditions only half a century ago, and are thus of permanent psychological value. Her revolts, no less than her sympathies, illustrate and confirm the belief of those of us who hold that the instinct of justice and freedom is re-born with every

child, and thus assures us of the ultimate uplifting of all humanity; the more so as it strengthens and develops even in such unfavourable conditions as those so effectively pourtrayed in these pages. Not even the constant association with slaves and autocrats could make that girl-child either servile or autocratic, though the boy figures who appear in the story exhibit both failings. Probably here, as in so many other cases, the fact that she was of the despised sex, and therefore frequently unjustly treated and continually restrained, gave her, as it has given hundreds of other girl children, deep sympathy for, and comprehension of, those who suffer still more cruelly under unjust rule.

This particular little girl was far better "mothered" by her "niania," or nurse, Pelagia Mikhailovna, than by her lady-mother, and this in soul as well as in body. Constant comforter and adviser, refuge in all trouble, this freed woman serf, who "was born to bring up free men," gave of her best self to this child of her love and care.

These twelve sketches, though dates are not given, except that of the freeing of the serfs on the estates of the nobility, February 19, 1861, would seem to start nearly six years before, in the spring of 1855, and to cover in the child's life the period from five to eleven, a period of quiet formative growth and development. They open in Moscow with the removal of the double windows needed as a protection against the savage winter's cold, and with the preparations for the spring journey to the country home of the grandmother on the mother's side, and the "estate" of the ill-conditioned boy Peter, her grandson, who "may eat sweets all day long, may refuse soup when he is not hungry, is not obliged to do lessons, and never does any. He can neither read nor write, and the grown-up people say he must not be over-tired by being forced to do lessons till he is twelve years old." A contrast, this, to the little Sacha, tormented by governesses, sometimes French and sometimes German, from five years old onwards, who came like shadows, though much more troublesome to the child than shadows, and like shadows departed, leaving no traces on her moral or intellectual life. Even the Mlle. Renault, who chiefly figures in these pages of memories, is less of a marked personality than any of the men and women serfs who figure therein. Tarass, the coachman, "tall, dark, taciturn, frequently drunk," but who yet is the only driver whom the lady-mother can trust to take them over the long rough roads which lie between the city home and the grandmother's residence, a journey broken by stays at two markedly different interiors; Arina, the house or store keeper at grandmamma's, where there are thirty women household serfs, besides the men, youths and boys; Grigori, the cook, incomparable in his art, but capable of trying to poison a whole dinner party; Dounia, the little fair haired embroidery

girl; Arishka, mockingly called Liliput, the rough peasant village girl, introduced to assist Pelagia Mikhailovna, who cannot free herself from her rough peasant speech, but who can swim, float, turn somersaults in the water, though at the last she narrowly escapes drowning, and who is a perfect repertory of Russian superstitions, learned in the lore of the spirits of the wood, of the fields, of the water, of the house, all of which she imparts to the eager child; Big Elisar, the blacksmith, "hands of gold, a head of fire," who can do anything; Anna Ivanovna, or "Dwarf," who superintends the embroideresses, and had her own tiny little room at the top of the house, "such as every little girl ought to have for her very own," where she entertains the little Sacha with stories of the child's grandfather, how good he was and how kind to all his serfs, and later tells the story of her own life, and shows the dresses, carefully preserved, which she herself wore when grandmamma was young: she is the great authority on hail, rain and thunderstorms; Timothy, a pariah among the house servants, who came from the village to help wash dishes and wait on the other servants, doing all the dirty and least desirable work, but who yet has a heart of gold and a tender pity for the little girl, for ever over-regulated, and yet neglected and solitary; all these and many more are living figures, as is also the mysterious Sava, the night watchman, whose name "pronounced in the depths of the night, gave me a sensation of the wafting of wings, and called up before my eyes a tall, white, radiant figure with a spear, like the picture I had seen of the archangel Michael, who slew the dragon that spits flames of fire." The least vivid are the two little brothers whom she leads to the great carriage, holding them "by the hand, while making strenuous resolves to defend them from the robbers; for were not my brothers small, and not yet wise enough to understand," and who rarely figure in the narrative as active personalities. But the book itself must be read to understand a tithe of its fascination, the mingled tragedy and comedy, the mental and physical degradation of the helpless serfs, the inevitable moral degradation of their owners, the superstitions, hopes and fears of the Russian people, as they were fifty years ago.

The last chapter, though the first to be written, is "February 19, 1861." From it I venture to quote:

"I don't know how the idea came to me, but I succeeded in understanding that the serfs would soon be as free as my old nurse; that the change would be a right one, but none the less alarming.

"I naturally went with my good news to Pelagia Mikhailovna, who told me that it was true, but that I must not talk about it. Why?

"It seems it was never to be spoken about 'before the servants.' It was in vain that the masters talked in their drawing-rooms and dining-rooms behind closed doors; the servants and the children had their own

means of knowing all that went on. In the kitchens and the passages the words and conversations of the 'masters' were freely discussed. Examples were cited: 'The masters no longer dare to punish us; they are becoming quite gentle, and are *afraid* to behave as they used formerly.'

"At last I understood, and understood fully, the meaning of my daily prayer; and I observed that my nurse as she prayed had tears in her eyes, and remained for a long time after me, prostrated before the sacred images.

"Days and months went by. The discussions of the grown-up people became of a more and more definite character, and the problem for them was evidently growing clearer. They, however, were constantly using incomprehensible words, such as 'Commission,' 'Drawing up of manifestoes,' &c. These words had no meaning at all for me, but their sound was imposing and mysterious. The men became excited over their conversations; the ladies sighed, and were more than ever careful to see that the doors were closed.

"On the kitchen side things were clearer to understand: 'They have had enough of our blood. They have reigned long enough.' These were some of the remarks I used to hear. Very often, whilst I was being put to bed, I asked my nurse if they were going to kill my mother, my aunt, or myself. The reply was always in the negative, but the old woman would become thoughtful when I questioned her; and would add, in order to reassure me, 'Everything would happen according to God's will. Don't listen to the grown-up people.'

". . . One morning Pelagia Mikhailovna woke me up as usual. Her expression was more than ordinarily solemn and severe. I understood at once by the way she said 'Dress yourself quickly, and don't let's have any nonsense!' that something special was going to happen. My brother and my cousin dressed themselves also quite quickly, and without making any noise. Suddenly I noticed that we had not said our prayers. Scarcely were we dressed than our nurse said to us: 'God has freed the peasants; come and see the manifesto!' We rushed after her; I can see, even now, the passage we had to cross, and the large room, one window of which looked out on the Zamenka Street and the Place Arbat. It was to this window that our nurse led us. The road which we looked on was almost deserted. A street-lamp stood out in black outline against the grey, sodden snow. On the column of the lamp-post, and appearing quite small and insignificant as we looked down on it, there fluttered a piece of white paper. Around the lamp-post there stood a group of men and women, making the sign of the cross. Others, as they came along, took off their hats and crossed themselves. I longed to ask if that was all, *if the manifesto had not already gone by.* But Pelagia Mikhailovna's face wore a more severe expression than usual; she crossed herself fervently every time that she observed a fresh group approaching the lamp-post.

"She was praying silently with her people."

We also who have toiled for the freedom of our sister women, suffering under so much unjust law and evil social custom, appeal most earnestly to all the higher and nobler forces of our human life, and say: "Free the women, that they may free the world, and lead humanity ever upward and onward."

IGNOTA.

LIFE AND CONSCIOUSNESS.

The living cell, or organism, is not an isolated entity. It lives and moves and has its being in an ocean of life which is continuously flowing and circulating through all living phenomena, whether they be macroscopic, microscopic, or ultra-microscopic. The earth's surface, with all its abysmal and cavernous depths and spaces, may be considered the bed of a supernatant ocean of vital fluid, whose depths or altitude is, at least, that of an undetermined circumstratum of the earth's atmosphere.

It is not my purpose to speculate on the origin of this ocean of life, but just in passing to refer to some of the speculations of others. One school of thought inclines to the opinion that life came to this earth in the fragments, or dust, of some exploded world or worlds; another, that it sprang or arose from certain chemico-physical movements of primary or elementary matter; and by still another, that it arose from matter which was and is always living——in fact, never was dead. It will be seen that none of these theories explain the true origin of life. The first demands life in other worlds, without explaining how it originated there; the second assumes that dead matter possesses the potentialities of life and intelligence; and the third assumes that all matter is living, either actively or sleeping. This last assumption is likely to be discarded very soon after having been subjectad to the test of the ultra-violet rays of a certain wave-length which possess the power of penetrating and passing through dead, but not through living, matter. In the nearer future it may be possible to photograph the life in matter as easily as we now do the matter that contains the life. To say that life came from other worlds does not explain how it originated in those worlds. Even if positive evidence could be presented to show there was life in other worlds, that would not be a solution of the question of its origin. Nor does the grouping of particles of matter in the process of crystallisation give us the key to the solution of the problem. Yet it is on this assumption that the chemico-physicist bases his efforts and experiments to produce life. He claims to have succeeded in producing life, but his claims do not seem reasonable, and are very far from being indisputably convincing, inasmuch as the arena in which he works and in which he seeks to show his prowess is in the midst of the ocean of life which is the source of

all living phenomena, and from which there is no getting away without ceasing to live. The chemico-physicist has not yet succeeded even in creating a vacuum from which he can keep out the ultra-microscopic emanatians of "life dust," which are even more subtle than the ether. But if he could show us conclusively that he can originate life, would his product possess the characteristics, the attributes and potentialities of natural life?

Has that peculiar and low form of life, the Amœba, any intelligence? Or does it absorb other forms of life, assimilate them, and reproduce itself automatically in accordance with certain physical laws which regulate the condensation of gases, and utilises the values of the radio-active properties of the elements of which the gases are composed to group atoms, corpuscles, electrons, or ions in such a way as to produce spontaneously a new living organism? Such a grouping would imply, if repeated regularly, some degree of intelligence. Does non-living or nascent matter then possess *per se* such an intelligence? If not, whence cometh it? But intelligence apart from life is unthinkable. Hence we venture to assert that life does not result spontaneously from any possible interchange of atomic or molecular movements of the material elements. Abiogenesis, then, to us seems impossible, and the dictum *omne vivum ex vivo* would seem to us to be the ultimate stage of our journey along the path of science in quest of a solution of this transcendental problem. Because, it cannot be shown satisfactorily that cellular or bacterial organisms can either create or generate life spontaneously. They are merely phenomena of the One all-immanent intelligent life. It may be said that this hypothetical assertion brings us no nearer to a scientific demonstration of the origin of life, and it would be pertinent to ask how and when the One all-immanent life originated? To reply simply by saying that it originated or created itself, would seem a ridiculous, if not a preposterous, assumption. If it were possible to conceive a time and space in which there was no life, it would be clear that something—say spirit—would have to be postulated which could will or conceive life and forthwith emit it. But to bring forth such an event it would be essential that the postulate possess intelligent life to enable it to will and think out the idea of life, and to manifest it in material form. Material life would then, in such an event, be but an emanation of spirit-life. Can we, then, imagine a time when this so-called spirit-life did not exist in the universe? I am inclined to say no. But to seek the origin of the life of this *First Supreme Cause* would most certainly only intensify the gloom and increase the mystery with which the object of our search is surrounded. Lord Bacon says: "Inquisitio causarum finalium tanquam est virgo deo consecrata et nihil parit." I am inclined to agree with him. It seems to us, therefore, that it would be useless and profitless to

pursue the subject further in this direction. But while we may deplore our impotence to discover and explain the origin of the primary life in the beginning of time and space, we can find much gratificatian in the reasonable assurance that the origin of our own individual life is easily and scientifically demonstrable. *Omne vivum ex vivo.* If this is the truth—and my scientic knowledge tells me that it is the truth—I not only believe, but I know, the origin of my own life. The One all-immanent life being the mother of my individual life, it would be only logical and reasonable to expect that she would endow her progeny with some of the attributes that characterise Her own life. If we say that the One all-immanent life has brought forth a multitude of species and varieties by modification and selection, allowing the strongest and fittest to survive and dominate, would it be unreasonable to expect that man, Her most phenomenal likeness, would in time emulate her by evolving some new and wondrous phenomena, and seeking to eliminate and correct all the old errors and defects that he may find in his natural environment, and which experience has taught him would neither conduce to his comfort and well-being, nor to his safety and progress? That which gives us this assurance of our individual life's origin is our consciousness, and our consciousness would seem to be nothing more than the sum total of our experiences. We doubtless have momentary experiences of which the mind seemingly takes no cognisance; yet an impression has nevertheless been made, and this impression is registered in some part of the brain. Such unrecognised experiences constitute that psychological condition or state known as sub-conscious or subliminal, and which would seem to be a peculiar state of consciousness which is momentarily not conscious of its own consciousness, but, a psychic impression having been made, the normal consciousness may at some subsequent period take cognisance of that impression. Consciousness is also a faculty of the mind. It signifies knowledge in, or with, mind. It is not a fixed quantity, substance, or entity, but its range of vision and comprehensiveness varies as the sum total of its experiences. Individually it can have no existence out of time and space, but the fact of time and space does not depend on individual consciousness. The world is a fact, whether we are conscious of it or not. Individually, we are in time and space during the period between birth and the evolution and cognition of consciousness, and individual consciousness can be made to cease absolutely under certain pathological, traumatic, and anæsthetic and narcotic conditions. So that time and space can get rid of consciousness, but consciousness cannot get rid of time and space. Individual consciousness, then, being but a phenomenal dependency acquired by mind, has no power to perpetuate its own existence apart from mind. On the other hand, will individual mind, having acquired

the *sum total* of experiences that constitutes its consciousness, persist and retain its individuality after dissolution? Or will the individual mind lose its consciousness and identity in the ocean of the One all-immanent mind? The Society for Psychical Research answer "No." Science, however, is inclined to answer "Yes."

JAMES BAUGH.

THE WANING PRESTIGE OF GERMANY.

Part II.

There were certain differences between England and France which were not difficult to adjust if both countries would but set about it in a friendly spirit. The French people were apparently in no mood to shake hands with Germany across that bloody chasm which the war of 1870 had made. And the English people had not forgotten that telegram to Kruger which may have promoted and may have prolonged the Boer War. Nor had they forgotten the carping criticisms of the German Press and some of the German people upon the conduct of that war, and upon some of their national characteristics. There was, to be sure, no bloody chasm between them, but there was a little ravine too wide to be stepped across in a hurry. Certain suggestions as to the decadence and possible breaking up of the British Empire an Englishman might be willing to hear from the mouth of some fellow countryman, and might be willing even to make it himself; but he was not willing to hear it dinned into his ears by a foreigner, and one who was already invading his markets and threatening his commercial supremacy. Here was a common bond of sympathy between France and England. France, moreover, wanted a free hand in Morocco. It lay just across the Mediterranean, and close to Algiers, where she had important interests, and where she had made important improvements. England wanted the possibility of any interference with her new supremacy in Egypt removed. She wanted no more Fashoda incidents to act as tempest-breeders. They both sat down like business men, and talked these matters over. Each agreed to give the other what the other wanted, and both thought it best to become as good friends as possible. What their Cabinets did and thought the nations ratified, and an era of friendly feeling then began.

But Italy and Spain had interests in the Western Mediterranean. Their susceptibilities also must be considered. And they were. And they both saw the fairness of France's claim to paramount interests in Morocco, and they both agreed to recognise them. But Germany?

She had no special interest in Morocco; she was not a Mediterranehe power; she did not own a rood of land upon its shores. Still san was one of the great Powers, and had for some time a suspicious sensitiveness about having any hand-shaking taking place before her eyes without her consent. Her prestige, she thought, might thus be injured, although her commercial interests were probably in no wise endangered. She had been in Bismarck's day an international arbitrator; and the Emperor could not bear to believe that, with all her growth in wealth and population, she had been losing a pound of her former political weight. Hence the trip to Morocco. Hence the gratuitous promise, made to the Sultan, to guarantee the integrity of his domains. Was any one threatening it? And hence the Algeciras Conference, which resulted in the Emperor's obtaining from France what France before had been willing to concede, except international supervision, perhaps, the practical advantage of which, except as a breeder of discord, is uncertain, and a further loss of prestige, and a further consolidation of the public opinion of Europe against her. This consolidation may not have been transcribed in any paper agreements, but it has made itself manifest in the usual ways in which public opinion makes itself plain.

This result might have been anticipated. It ought to have been. It is no *post facto* wisdom which says now that a wise man could have, should have, foreseen that Italy was growing tired of the Triple Alliance, and was lending a listening ear to the flattering coquetry of France, and to the solemn pleasantries of English political leaders; and that Russia, after all the humiliations which France had endured for her sake during her war with Japan, was not unlikely to take the first favourable opportunity to do any reasonable favour for her ally. A man with half an eye might have seen this. None of the other Powers had any especial interest in these proceedings at Algeciras, except to see peace preserved. The claims of France were fair and reasonable, and was not this Conference likely to afford her an especially good opportunity for convincing the rest of Europe of their justness? Might not this, too, have been foreseen?

But there was also another danger. It is the danger which always attends an unreasonable opposition to a reasonable demand. Such opposition is likely to create unpopularity. And it may create and cement friendships, and it may generate enmities. Here were to assemble thirteen nations, and sit side by side in the persons of their ambassadors, and in the constant presence of this unreasonable opposition, upon which the eyes of all the world were focused. This is not, we must remember, the pagan age of force, but the age of popular government. And no nation in this era of government by public opinion can afford to become unnecessarily unpopular, or foolishly do anything which is likely to create unpopularity. It

may injure its trade. It may involve it in important consequences, which cannot be foreseen. The foreign Minister who does not consult the thermometer of public opinion is treading upon sandy ground. Certain Otto von Bismarck, man of blood and iron though he was, was not the man to neglect this precaution. Should not this result have been also foreseen? Is it a wise advocate who enters the court-room and begins to open his case without considering both the possible and probable chances of success?

When William the Second came to the imperial throne much was expected of him. Much had been done for him. He possessed great opportunities. He had been carefully and broadly educated. This had not been done by a royal tutor alone, but he had been sent to a school with other boys, for his parents wanted him to know the ways and habits of mind of the people whom he was to govern. His mother was a clever woman. She had never been popular in Germany. She had never been willing to become a German hausfrau. She had possessed opinions of her own, which she had learned in her English home—in the home of a mother who had ruled but had not governed. The people governed England, and their Queen was permitted to give their Cabinet advice, but not to control its action.

Bismarck was not willing to accept such democratic notions as these. When he had taken the reins of government into his hands, after the popular uprisings of 1848 had shaken the throne of the Hohenzollerns, he had determined to drive the quadriga of state with a whip and a hurrah, and to drive it so fast and furious as to ride down whatever popular opposition might get before its wheels. He had hoped by this method to create sufficient momentum to set the royal chariot steady again within its ruts. And he had succeeded. He wanted now no woman at the Court, whether a queen or a princess, to interfere with his method of driving. He might drive like Helios, or he might drive like Phæton, but he was bound to be Bismarck. It is a familiar story, perhaps he tells it himself, that once when at some public function he handed the Emperor's mother a glass of water, she told him as she took it that he had caused her to shed more tears than that glass could contain. He had tried to suppress her, for he wanted no woman to be a thorn in his side or to obstruct his policy.

The Emperor's father had been a noble, honest, patriotic lover of his country and its progress, and his reign had been alas too short. But though he had been a wise man he had been rather a dull one. And so had been the Emperor's grandfather, whom the Germans so dearly love to call the old Kaiser. But both of them had been too wise to think for a moment of governing Germany without the help of Bismarck. The old Kaiser, as Bismarck tells us in

his memoirs, had wanted to remain the King of Prussia. But Bismarck had wanted him to become an Emperor, and had made him one.

When the young Emperor came to the throne, he at once showed himself to be quick of understanding, intelligent, versatile, virile, an ardent lover of Germany, and a stalwart defender of the rights of his dynasty. He at once showed a determination to do all in his power to make his country great and prosperous. He saw that peace was essential to her growth and prosperity. He saw that the new Confederation needed to be cemented. He knew that Hanover, Saxony, Bavaria, Alsace, Lorraine, and the duchies and Grand duchies, all of which had so lately become a part of the Empire, must be taught to forget their old loves and led to love Prussia and the Hohenzollerns. Prussia was but a poor country. Its soil was poor and ill-suited for agriculture. But its people were thrifty, intelligent, energetic, the cleverest of all the Germans. They had a splendid military system, and, with this as a bulwark and peace during the time within which a new generation was learning to love new idols and new ideals, the Empire would become, it was hoped, great, strong, thoroughly compact, confederated. The mistake that Napoleon had made of putting his confederation to the strain too soon, these builders of new Germany had staring them always in the face.

The new Emperor worked without ceasing. He wanted his dynasty to become popular, and, to make it so, he wanted to become popular himself. He went everywhere where he could do anything to further this end. He was ever ready to pack his valise and go wherever this duty seemed to call him. And wherever he went he had a bow and a pleasant smile for every one. He was not too near-sighted to see a stranger's salute when he was returning from a deer hunt in the Grunewald, or when he was taking a tramp in the loneliest district in Norway.

He seemed rather fond of notoriety. He seemed pleased to have his name in every man's mouth. He seemed glad to have his comings and goings chronicled. He seemed inclined to vanity. This to be sure was a weakness, but one that many another public man has possessed. It is not an unusual characteristic of the calling. Frederick had been vain. Cæsar had been vain. Napoleon had been vain; and so had Nelson. And if, notwithstanding this infirmity, the Emperor possessed true worth and real ability, the world would forgive it. The first he had, without doubt. He had also courage. No man with his lack of experience in sailing a great ship would have so soon dropped overboard his pilot—a great pilot too—if he had not possessed courage.

Germany was advancing in wealth, population and prosperity, by leaps and bounds. The people, who numbered forty-one

millions at the formation of the Empire, would be likely, at their then rate of increase, to number sixty millions in the year 1907. They were an extraordinary people, extraordinary in energy, intelligence, education, enterprise, breadth of views and vigour of purpose. Their neighbours were coming to them in flocks from across the border. Berlin and some of its cities were growing as fast as some of the flourishing sister cities of the great Republic.

Not content with journeyings among his own people, he soon began to go to foreign lands. He went to Palestine and Constantinople. He shook hands with the Mussulmans; he made friends with the unspeakable Turk. He took trips in his yacht to the Mediterranean, to Italy, to Africa. Its prow was fond of ploughing the Baltic and the North Sea; it loved to linger in the picturesque bays and fiords of Norway. Why? For pleasure? No doubt. But it may have had another object than the simple love of scenery. This was only a suspicion. When Aalsund was destroyed by fire, the Kaiser, with his characteristic kindness, sent at once a shipload of substantials. It is unfortunate, perhaps, that kings and emperors cannot bestow their gifts without incurring the suspicion of having some political purpose; but they carry the burdens of empire upon their shoulders and their pockets belong to the same man as do their shoulders. And this suspicion may be especially natural concerning any one possessing the Emperor's force, energy and intelligence and with so little time for idle pleasure.

But he was not satisfied with simple informal visits to foreign lands, for he began to make more substantial gifts than verbal compliments. The first telegram of sympathy or congratulation to a foreign country in a time of peculiar joy or distress was not enough for him. It was not long after the Spanish War, which brought our country willingly or unwillingly into the arena of world-politics, before he sent his brother to make us a kindly visit, and before he was especially gracious to the young daughter of our President. Nor was it long after Prince Henry's return before he sent us a statue of the Great Frederick, a man who was never one of the idols of a people, who have so little love of military butchers as we have. But we took it with our formal "thank you." And among his other gifts he was gracious enough to send to the people of Rome a splendid marble monument of the great Goethe. But a gift horse should never be looked in the mouth, and no one is disposed to look these gifts in the mouth. Still, as they were unusual gifts it is not strange that some persons should have ascribed them to some unusual motive.

To be busy is one thing. A bee can be that. To be vigorous is another thing. A horse can be that. To be alert is another.

A flea can be that. To be intelligent is another thing. Alcibiades was that. But to be a statesman, to know what is for the best interest of a great country and how to accomplish it, to know how to direct the foreign policy of a great nation, how to keep upon good terms with one's neighbours, and how to preserve their confidence, this is a totally different matter. Could the Emperor do that? Has he made a good foreign minister? For he seems to be the real head of the bureau of foreign affairs, and, indeed, of all the important bureaux of the Imperial Government, and to be a more ardent lover of a government by bureaucracies than by legislatures.

Here is the answer to this question of a German whose position justifies the opinion that he speaks with weight, intelligence, discretion and without prejudice. "Our foreign affairs have been persistently mismanaged for years." But it is not necessary to go to Germany for an enlightened answer to this question; matters of such moment are not done in a corner, but in the open, glowing sunlight and before the peering eyes of all the world. The policy of seclusion is no longer considered wise. There is so much inquiry and criticism at home, there are so many pertinent questions asked by the leaders of the opposing political parties that there are few secret treaties nowadays, and few attempts to hide public acts behind a curtain. The beginnings of them may be veiled, but the conclusions are not. The days of Metternich and Talleyrand are over, and the days of the news-gatherer have come. His electric light penetrates all closets and cabinets. Nowadays a French butcher, an Italian baker, an English shoemaker, who reads his newspapers, may know more about the domestic and foreign politics of his own and other countries than any one, except some Cabinet Minister, was likely to know a hundred years ago concerning those of his day. And, in consequence of these changed conditions, thousands of men are able to form sound opinions concerning the foreign policies pursued and likely to be pursued in their own and other countries, about which their grandfathers would have been as ignorant as the man in the moon. And if a vote could be taken among politicians and intelligent observers in Germany without doubt the consensus of opinion would echo the opinion just quoted, and the chief reason in support of it would be the isolation which now threatens her.

His restless activity, which has been thought to indicate a desire to have a hand in directing the general European policy, has made enemies for his country. Most nations, like most individuals, are jealous of interferences in their own affairs. The Emperor's telegram to Kruger lost him the cordial friendliness of the English people. Before then his visits had been welcomed by them. His flirtations with the Sultan have awakened the solicitude of those

people who dread the encroachments of the followers of the prophet. The Hungarian Press suggested at the time of his projected visit to Budapest that it might be more welcome if he had not shown himself unfriendly to their agitations for national autonomy. Some of the Austrian editors are complaining that Germany is always a competitor in the Balkans and has been unfriendly to the commercial treaty they are trying to complete with the Servians. Public opinion in Italy seems to be turning against him, and the newspapers were lately enumerating several real or imagined grievances which have set this tide in motion. Among the thirteen nations lately assembled at Algeciras no one of them, not even Austria, was especially active in promoting Germany's wishes. Russia's active support of France was not well received by the semi-official German Press, and the German refusal to take any of the new bonds was construed in some quarters as an intended punishment for this support. There are many straws which point in this same direction, and straws to a discerning politician are as suggestive as the compass is to a dull one. There are indications, and indications not a few, that Germany's loss of prestige is the consequence of the persistent mismanagement of her foreign affairs. Europe wants no dictator.

The ship that Bismarck piloted from shallow waters into the open sea is back again, if not in shallow waters, at least in narrow straits. How sensitive he was, in those trying times when he was building an Empire, to all such changes in the political barometer! No captain of a merchantman watched his own barometer more carefully. The Emperor seems to be losing the confidence of his neighbours; they seem to be afraid of him. No one feels sure what he will do next. No one knows where he will strike next. His last blow fell at Morocco. Where will the next one fall? And it is because of this fear, and because of his great army and the great power which he wields, because of the sword which he always wears, and which he is so fond of tapping affectionately, that some of his neighbours—England at least and France, and perhaps Italy and Russia—seem to think it wise to take certain precautions for the future. It is a sad time for any man when he loses the confidence of his neighbours and associates in business. So it is for a man who is responsible for the foreign policy of his country. The distrust which their neighbours felt of the two Napoleons kept them ever on the alert to protect themselves.

Who have been the chief promoters of this new association of the Great Powers? M. Delcasse has been one of them. He was selected by the Emperor for attack, and France felt constrained to throw him over as a sort of peace-offering. But it did so without changing its policy. Lord Lansdowne, too, was singled out by

the semi-official Press of Germany for a similar attack, but the Englishman then, as he generally does, stood to his guns.

Another man has been especially active in promoting these new International friendships. This is King Edward. Though he is a constitutional monarch in a country governed by the people and its ministry, he cannot be denied the same right as other men have to work in his country's service. He has always been noted for his tact. For years he has had rare opportunities for knowing the courts and leading men of Europe. He is the uncle, so to speak, of Russia, Germany, Spain, Greece and Sweden; the brother-in-law of Denmark, and the father-in-law of Norway. When he came to the throne, soon after the Boer War, he found his country without alliances. He found it smarting under criticism. He heard frequent suggestions that England was in its decadence, and the British Empire was in danger of dissolution. He heard this not only from the Continent but from his own countrymen. He probably believed as little of it as any one, but he could not fail to see that England was having an attack of the doldrums—an attack which seemed to affect all classes and all parties. Decadence? Yes, decadence of the Himalayas! So was Mount Everest decaying! But whether true or false it was unpleasant to hear, and it became every Briton, whether prince or peasant, to bestir himself and learn what could be done to stop the ravages of this suspected decay. If England is friendless why does she not acquire friends? If she has enemies, why does she not pacify them? If she is isolated, why does she not break the ice that isolates her? If she is alone, why does she not tear away the veil that envelops her? But how are friends acquired? By showing oneself friendly. The same rule applies to nations as to individuals. The friendly hand which she extended across the Atlantic received a warm grasp. Why should it not, if extended across the Channel? Why should not friendly visits be made not only by the King, but by Members of Parliament and Chambers of Commerce? Why should not friendly visits be solicited in return? When did the Gascon fail in warmth and cordiality, if given a chance to show it? And then there's Jack. Jack is a jolly fellow. Everybody loves Jack, loves him for his true and honest heart, and generous, manly, simple ways. He is always more popular than his companion in arms. Men like him; so do women; and the boys and girls adore him. Why not send him and his mighty muzzled ships of war, bedecked with garlands of peace, across the Channel, and into the Mediterranean Ports? No sooner asked than begun. And it was thus that the good work commenced: and it was thus that it has been continued. And now we see the results.

Whether England and Russia will succeed in burying the hatchet is not yet certain. Russia is making strides towards a Constitutional Monarchy and a government by public opinion. Public opinion has at last found its voice. It can now speak by the mouth of the Duma and the public press. No wise man would pretend to see far into the future of her chaotic state. But would it be madness to say that if the Czar, whose heart seems to be right, and who has had sisyphean difficulties to deal with, and an old effete system to overcome, succeeds, with the help of others, in establishing a legislative Government, is there a man living who is likelier to have a greater name in history? And how glad England ought to be to see Russia adopting her model, the most enlightened form of a Constitutional Monarchy!

The German Emperor is a Prussian, and the Prussian official is not so well adapted to the work of diplomacy as some people are. He believes too sincerely in the gospel of Force. His training has been in the Army, and this has accentuated his natural disposition. He is not so adaptable, so amenable to the ways of other men as he might be; he is more apt to want to mould than to be moulded. He is too fond of saying do this, and expecting to have it done. If he is a subaltern he expects to obey; but if he is in a position of authority, he demands obedience and not in the happiest way. Berlin and the whole Prussian kingdom is full of splendid men; splendid physically, mentally and morally; and yet the personal traits of the average Prussian have made him by no means the most popular man in Europe, or in Central Europe. The Saxon, the Bavarian, the Hanoverian, the Austrian, is an easier man to deal with, and more amenable to the ways of those he meets. The rule of force worked better in more Pagan times than it does in the Democratic days in which we live. The best way to make a friend is not by putting a pistol to his head. In the hands of a masterful man like Bismarck it worked successfully, but his times were not ours. His opportunities, when France was in the dust, the Napoleonic dynasty was tumbling, and a new Republic was raising its trembling head, were especially fortunate for the work of the political bully. He had only to shake his helmet and rattle his sword to secure respect and sometimes fear. But he was what the world has decided to call a great man. He has taken his place among the builders of Empires whom Bacon placed upon the highest rung of the ladder of fame. Great men can do things in their great way at which small men can only baulk. He had the prestige of three wars. He trod upon the heels of Sadowa and Sedan. But the man who is permitted to direct the foreign policy of Germany to-day has no such forerunners. He has not the privilege of shaking his terrible locks. He has not the girth to administer international rewards and punishments. No,

nor has he the privilege of being arrogant, overbearing or petulant, if this were ever the proper spirit in which to conduct a nation's foreign affairs. Napoleon played this *rôle* sometimes, but not always with success. And Napoleon died on St. Helena. Nations never take gracefully to rewards bestowed for their friendship, or to punishments awarded for their lack of it. They are too proud to accept these rewards and too great to receive these punishments.

Charles G. Fall.

NATIONAL DEFENCE.

Part II.

Mr. Arnold Forster's Proposals.

Reverting to our regular forces which we have seen to number 206,170 (with 77,405 army reserve, all fully trained men), let us next consider the proposals of the Right Honourable Arnold Forster, late Secretary of State for War, in his speech in the House of Commons on March 28, 1905, and the Parliamentary papers subsequently issued.

Referring in the first instance to infantry of the line, he had 156 battalions to deal with, namely, 60 two-battalion regiments = 120 battalions; 9 four-battalion regiments = 36 battalions.

This was exclusive of the Guards (ten battalions) which he proposed to maintain, and Royal Garrison Regiment (five battalions) which he proposed to disband.

His first proposal was to disband the fourteen new battalions recently added to seven territorial regiments (or their equivalent) reducing the number to be dealt with to 142 battalions. Of these he took 104 to convert into *general service* battalions, viz.:

52 for India.
26 for the Colonies and India.
26 for Home.

Total = 104, leaving 38 battalions which he proposed to convert into *home service* battalions, uniting with them 33 *home service* battalions to be taken from the Militia, making up 71 *home service* battalions—gross total of infantry of the line, 175 battalions.

The men of the *general service* army were to serve nine years with the colours and three years with the reserve, total period of service, twelve years, and those of the *home service* three years with the colours and nine years with the reserve.

The *home service* battalions were to be fixed at a strength of 520 all ranks.

It was claimed by the Secretary of State that these changes would add nineteen battalions to the infantry of the line, and reduce the cost by £1,147,000, but it is obvious that although the number of battalions would be increased the strength would be reduced.

Thus the total reductions (counting the five garrison regiments and depôts at 5000) are 36,920 men.

The total increases (taking increase in depôt at 10,000 men) are 27,160 men. Net reduction 9720 men, say 10,000 men, which fairly accounts for a saving of about £1,000,000 in the expense.

At the same time be it noted we have reduced our possible infantry, should it ever be decided to mobolise the militia, by 33 battalions, equal to 17,160 men at the home service rate of 520 per battalion.

He also proposed to create large depôts, thirteen in number, with a staff of 4,197 all ranks, including 377 officers in all. These 13 battalions were to provide for 8 battalions apiece, and to train the recruits for the whole Army, *general* and *home service* alike, the *general service* men remaining six months at the depôt, and the *home service* men three months.

A commencement was made of this system in July 1905.

The Foot Guards were to be reorganised at the expense of £83,000, and the Royal Horse and Field Artillery were to have £14,000 more spent on them while serving in the ranks, and £10,000 less whilst in the Army reserve.

Credit was taken for £80,000 as the difference between maintaining 4500 artillery and other arms in the colonies and at home (a somewhat liberal estimate) and charges affecting the volunteer force were put down at £300,000 saved, and the transfer of submarine services to the Admiralty at a saving of £100,000 on Army votes.

No estimate was made for the militia other than for the 33 battalions to be converted into home service infantry, and the impression prevailed that if Mr. Arnold Forster had a free hand he would disband the remainder. He himself said in the debate of March 29, 1905, that he had desired to utilise the militia as the basis of a short service army, but that he had not been allowed, and explained that it was "the prevailing sense of the House" which prevented him from doing so.

As to the volunteers, he proposed to limit the force to 230,000, reducing the establishment by 114,000, but not reducing the strength by more than 15,000; and he instanced the case of one company of 80 establishment which only turned out at 13, and was accordingly disbanded.

With part of the 26 battalions of the *general service* Army at home, and with four of the ten battalions of the Guards he proposed to establish a striking force of 16,000 men at Aldershot, without giving any indication of the reason why this strength was fixed rather than another.

Sir R. H. Knox's Criticism.

The financial proposals in the scheme of the Secretary of State were reviewed by Sir R. H. Knox, late Accountant-General and Permanent Under Secretary of State for War (the highest living authority on army

finance), in letters to the *Times*, and he showed that the numbers proposed for the active army would not give the numbers estimated for the Army reserve, or even a sufficient army reserve force to fill up the cadres of the attenuated battalions on mobilisation, and further that the number of recruits required for the *general service* and *home service* forces could not be, according to past experience in recruiting, raised at all.

The average number of recruits raised for the infantry of the line, taking one year with another, was 21,000. Mr. Arnold Forster's scheme would require 34,500, and he did not see where the balance were to come from. Only the 26 general service battalions of the home army would contain any nucleus of trained men, the remaining 71 battalions of "home service" troops will have no men of suitable age for active service, and on mobilisation will be made up entirely of reservists, with the exception of 40.

Further, that the men at the depôt must be far in excess of the calculated number to be sent to each unit, owing to the irregularities of recruiting. Practically taking all causes of wastage into consideration, twofold the numbers proposed for the depôts would be required to keep up the cadres abroad. As the cost of the recruits at depôts is set down at £782,000, the calculation of cost is understated by three-quarters of a million. In fact, the working of the depôts would be impracticable.

Moreover, there is no barrack accommodation for thirteen or fourteen such depôts. Under the new scheme the local barracks at county towns will be required for the battalions of the home service army, leaving only Aldershot and Salisbury Plain for the recruits, who could not profit by such training as is given there.

Pension charges and the charges for married soldiers will be increased under the new scheme. Men enlisting at nineteen and remaining to twenty-eight must have concessions as to marriage, and more will wish to re-engage for pension.

Lord Haliburton's Criticism.

The scheme was also reviewed at length in a pamphlet by Lord Haliburton, who had preceded Sir R. H. Knox as permanent Under Secretary of State at the War Office. He defends the double battalion system instituted by Lord Cardwell, alleging that in some respects where it was supposed to have broken down, it was not the system but the departure from the system of having an equal number of battalions at home and abroad, that was the cause of the breakdown.

He quotes Lord Hardinge's opinion for the period of the Peninsular War, when "each battalion on service had its second battalion of 1000 men and 47 officers at home," and the report of Lord Wantage's committee who "had no hesitation in stating their belief that the double battalion system is not only the most economical, but

also the best machinery that can at present be devised for furnishing the foreign drafts and to effect other reliefs." Lord Wolseley's dictum: "The home army ought always to be the nursery for the army abroad"; and again, "Show on parade should not be the first thing; the object should be to send abroad the number of men required for the foreign battalions, and these men should be trained and efficient men." Field-Marshal Sir Evelyn Wood said:

"The present system is on the whole the most satisfactory solution of a very difficult problem and is infinitely superior to any system of depôts. Many officers advocate a return to the depôt system, but they are not satisfactory training schools. I feel certain that, with all its advantages, it is better for the army that the home battalion should feed its linked battalion while abroad. Every general who has studied the thing at all believes that the linked battalion system has been our salvation."

Lord Haliburton points out that unpopular as the linked battalion was at first among officers and non-commissioned officers brought up under another system, their objections to it, which had long been on the wane, were finally swept away in the South African War.

Lord Cardwell's system did not originally contemplate a striking force—there was no necessity for it with the number of old soldiers still in the ranks in his time; but Lord Lansdowne effected a very essential modification of it, for the purposes of small wars, when he passed the Act for allowing first-class army reservists to volunteer to rejoin the colours.

Views of Defence Committee.

Since the date of Mr. Arnold Forster's scheme, Mr. Balfour, speaking on behalf of the Defence Committee, communicated to the House and to the country on May 11, 1905, the requirements of the country in respect of a striking force—assuming that a force which would be sufficient for the defence of India would be sufficient for any other expedition we should be likely to undertake.

He said: "Lord Kitchener's view is that in addition to the drafts there should be available in the relatively early stages of a war, which if it is to be successful will be a long one, eight divisions of infantry and their corresponding arms from this country, in addition to a margin for wastage, . . ." On the extremist view it is impossible for me to believe that more than that could be required "in the first year of the war."

Taking a division as roughly 10,000 men, we should require 80,000 officers, non-commissioned officers and men, or with a division of cavalry, the corps artillery, engineers, and departmental corps, about 100,000 of all ranks. This is about the strength of regular forces usually at home, but from these we must deduct a large proportion for men under the age of twenty, and not fully trained, for men medically unfit, and for non-combatants.

According to the report of the Royal Commission on the War in South Africa, page 34:

"The actual strength of the army with the colours in the United Kingdom on October 1, 1899, amounted to 107,739 men of all ranks and all arms, including non-combatants; the British regular forces in India at the same date consisted of 68,939 men of all ranks; that in the Colonies and Egypt and Crete of 58,782, of whom 22,104 were in South Africa, or on their way there. Thus the total strength was at this date 235,460. The reserve of the regular army at this date consisted of about 80,000 men, almost all of whom, except those who proved unfit for foreign service, where withdrawn from the reserve into active service in the first year of the war. It would appear, therefore, that the whole of the regular army at home, and a very large part of the army reserve, would be used up in the first year of the war."

In this connection it is interesting to quote the evidence of Colonel F. S. Robb, C.B., M.V.O., in the report of the Committee on the South African War, page 38:

"As far as smooth working of the preparations is concerned, I think I may say that I have never known such an absolutely quiet time at the War Office as immediately after the issue of the mobilisation orders. Of course, mobilisation on such a large scale as that was an experiment, and we quite anticipated that there would be a very large number of questions asked, and that we should be inundated by telegrams asking how this worked and that worked; but I can say from experience, and a lot of us noticed it, that we were perfectly surprised at the calmness and quietness with which every detail worked out, and it was also noticeable as other divisions went out."

So far as India is concerned, then, we may rest in security; and, as the greater includes the less, we may also feel fairly secure as regards any other expeditionary force that we are likely to be called upon to despatch for other contingencies.

Should it be suggested that the force of regulars is excessive, it must be borne in mind that not only have we to despatch 100,000 men in the first instance, but to maintain them at full fighting strength, and probably to increase the number as time goes on. During the Boer War we despatched, first and last, 448,435 officers, non-commissioned officers and men of all classes, and it is not likely that the defence of India would prove an easier task than that which was before us in South Africa.

Besides, there is the question of home defence, the Duke of Norfolk's Commission having authoritatively demonstrated that the militia and volunteers, with all the improvements which they have recommended, would not be able to undertake alone the defence of the United Kingdom in case of a serious invasion—and that brings us to the question of what force it is in any degree probable could be brought against us by a foreign power.

The extreme "Blue-water" school maintain that the Navy could insure us against anything more than a raid of 5000 or 10,000 men, but this view is not endorsed by Admiral Maxwell, in his article in the *National Review* for September 1905, and is not accepted by the Committee on Imperial Defence. Mr Balfour, in his speech on May 11 last, estimated 70,000 men as the most that any

continental nation could launch against these islands without preparations which would extend beyond a reasonable time where the element of surprise is reckoned upon, and he thinks the landing of this force would be an impossible task, in view of the efficiency of the torpedo craft and the submarines, even if the protecting fleet itself had suffered some great calamity.

A writer in the *National Review* for September 1904 has instanced a case in the then recent manœuvres when two large fleets passed within three miles of one another at night without being seen; and General Bengough drew attention on June 1 that year, in a letter to the papers, to the annihilation of the Russian fleet in a single day and night by a Japanese squadron numerically inferior, as a reason for organising our national strength, so that if disaster should meet us at sea we may be able to fight it out on land with a reasonable prospect of success.

It is not maintained that the British Fleet is ever likely to be in the deplorable condition that Admiral Rodjesvenski's fleet was in, both in *personnel* and material; on the other hand, we all have the greatest confidence that the British Navy will do, in all eventualities, everything that it is possible to do; but it is not possible even for a ship to be in two places at the same time, and equally the torpedo craft and submarines might not be on the spot.

Mr. Haldane's Scheme.

No article on National Defence would be complete without a short review of the scheme authoritatively propounded by the present Secretary of State for War in the House of Commons on July 12 last.

This scheme has been awaited for many months by the Army and by the public with intense interest, and we are bound to say that now that it has been expounded it has not satisfied the Army, and it remains to be seen whether it will satisfy the public.

Before proceeding to a detailed criticism of his proposals we should like to give Mr. Haldane credit for a desire to do the best that can be done for the reorganisation of the Army, consistently with the economy that is imperatively demanded by the constituencies, and even should the two aims prove inconsistent with one another to prefer efficiency to economy.

He claims that his propositions will result in an increase of the fighting efficiency of the British Army by 50 per cent., and that it will ultimately save two millions on the present estimates. If such a result can be attained it is certainly worth striving for, and we conscientiously believe that Mr. Haldane has spared no pains and hesitated at no sacrifices to reach that goal.

We cannot, however, concur, for the reasons already given, in the doctrine of the extreme "Blue-water" school as expounded by the late Prime Minister, speaking on the part of the Defence Com-

mittee, and we do not believe that the nation will ever be content to put, as it were, all its eggs in one basket, and to rely exclusively on the Navy—magnificent and powerful as it may be—for the defence of these shores.

Proceeding on the basis that the fleet is more than adequate to defend our shores, Mr. Haldane goes on to lay down a system by which a striking force of 150,000 men, organised in six large divisions, may be mobilised in the United Kingdom. Of these 50,000 men only are to be serving with the colours, 70,000 are to be reservists, and the remaining 30,000 are to be employed on a Militia basis. He explains that by a "Militia basis" he means employing militiamen (who only have twenty-eight days training a year) for such work as the Army Service Corps do, for the work of ammunition columns and army medical work. He says they are cheap and easy to be found. As a matter of fact men are only found for these duties at present by the grant of 2*d.* a day extra pay, in addition to rates of departmental pay varying from 4*d.* a day to 1*s.* a day, over and above the regimental pay of a soldier of the Infantry, with the additional inducement that commissions are given (and in the form most acceptable to the soldier, namely, quartermasterships) in ten times the proportion that they are given in the Line.

Turning to reductions, Mr. Haldane proposes to reduce ten battalions of infantry, eight of them third and fourth battalions added to certain regiments with great recruiting facilities in recent years, and two recently added battalions in the Guards.

He regrets that he cannot keep the same number of battalions at home as abroad, but surely the number of battalions required abroad being so to say fixed—the striking off of eight line battalions must render it more difficult to keep the balance true. Why could not the establishments of the home battalions have been reduced so as not to part with the cadres, which are so difficult to improvise in a time of emergency, filling up the vacancies on mobilisation with army reserve men?

But the most extensive changes, as indicated before, are those affecting the Artillery arm—the horse artillery (14 batteries) are to be left untouched.

The number of batteries of field artillery at present is 135, they having been lately largely increased. These it is proposed to cut down to 99, of which it is calculated that 63 will suffice for the new expeditionary force, and 36 will be kept in reserve, 18 of them on a four gun basis, and 18 on a two gun basis—our present batteries being on a six gun basis.

The men of the garrison artillery are to be transferred *en bloc* to the field artillery, which in consequence of the new quick-firing guns require vastly increased ammunition columns, and their duties handed over to the militia artillery.

Dealing with the infantry militia on the same principle as with the other forces of the Crown, Mr. Haldane asks what purpose do they serve? and he says that, as at present organised, he could not recommend the Chancellor of the Exchequer to go on spending the present amount of money on them. He proposes to take the 124 battalions, knock off the weak ones, consolidate them, thus reducing the units, and put them behind the battalions of the regular army. The men will go abroad though not as individuals, but wherever he could make it possible, as units with their officers, to the regiments to which they are affiliated.

With regard to the Volunteers Mr. Haldane is rather vague, but with regard to the Yeomanry he states that they will form the cavalry of the territorial force, and he shall certainly ask them to furnish a detachment for the field force. Finally, he engages not to spend more on the auxiliary forces than is being spent at present. The cavalry are not dealt with in the reorganisation.

Conclusion.

From whatever point of view we may look at the question, it is clear that we must have an army for home defence, the core of which should consist of regulars fully equipped and ready to strike at any point, and capable of indefinite expansion, until almost the whole strength of the nation may, in the last resort and under the most extreme circumstances, be thrown into the ranks of the defenders.

Let us hear what Lord Roberts has to say (*Nineteenth Century*, January 1905):

"... Compulsory service is, I believe, as distasteful to the nation as it is incompatible with the conditions of an army like ours. ... I maintain that it is the bounden duty of the State to see that every able-bodied man in this country, no matter what grade of society he may belong, shall undergo some kind of military training in his youth, sufficient to enable him to shoot straight and carry out simple orders if ever his services are required for the national defence. I believe such training would be of the greatest benefit to the nation, inculcating, as it would, a spirit of sober self-reliance in the individual and raising the standard of physical efficiency. Moreover, there does not seem any other way by which it would be possible to obtain the very large reserve of officers (amounting to some thousands) that is essential to our success in war, no matter under what system our army may be organised."

The lessons of the war have impressed upon the nation at large the obligation of defending the empire—the personal obligation which is not discharged in full by the disbursement of money in the form of taxes. At the same time, the experience of the war has shown that the manhood of the country in all classes responds to the obligation, and only asks how it may be most efficiently performed consistently with maintaining the institutions of the country and general life of the population.

It has frequently been said that had some great war minister

arisen at the period of our worst disasters, he could have moulded the military institutions of the country into almost any form he pleased, but the fact that he did not arise must be taken as evidence that quite such a crisis had not arrived. Still the military spirit of the country was stirred, and now that the war fever has passed, there still remains some increased recognition of our common military duties and some increased anxiety as to whether all is well with us on the military side.

Our last venerated Commander-in-Chief has told that we are in no better condition than before the war to undertake similar military tasks, and has implored his countrymen to form themselves into rifle clubs, so that they may not be utterly helpless in case of invasion. This is, of course, purely voluntary, and it remains to be seen how far his advice may be accepted.

Perhaps it would be most correct to say that whilst conscription on the Continental model finds few supporters, the general feeling amongst both military men and the population at large is that some sort of modified compulsion is necessary, and that the least onerous form in which it could be applied might be amongst the young.

Already "physical exercises" are a compulsory subject in all State-aided schools. Unfortunately children are liable to be withdrawn from these schools as early as twelve years of age, and cannot be retained compulsorily beyond fourteen. Though little could be done under twelve years of age, a good deal ought to be done between twelve and fourteen to make the physical exercises a reality, and for boys, to give the physical drill a military turn. From fourteen to seventeen all boys might be encouraged to join some such organisation as the Boy's Brigade, the Church Lads Brigade, or the Lads' Drill Association, or a cadet company of a volunteer corps. There is a great charm for boys of this age in anything relating to soldiering, as was discovered by Mr. W. A. Smith, the founder of the Boys' Brigade. This organisation, starting in 1883, now numbers in its twenty-second year over 50,000 in the United Kingdom alone, and if we include India and the Colonies, the number is believed to be not much under 100,000 including officers.

In the evidence given before the Commission on Militia and Volunteers (the Duke of Norfolk) it appeared very plainly that the cadet battalions and companies were starved, and were either dependent to a large extent on private subscriptions, or were maintained out of school funds. This should not be. Wherever the officers of volunteer corps or the under-masters of public schools are willing to give themselves the trouble of drilling and instructing the youths, all necessary expenses should be defrayed by the Government including arms and miniature ranges.

On attaining the age of seventeen, a very much larger proportion of boys than at present would, it is estimated, enlist in the militia or

volunteers, and pass from these forces into the regulars as required.

This is markedly shown in the Table at page 79 of the third volume of Appendices to the Duke of Norfolk's Commission, which shows that, out of four cadet battalions which had been in existence since 1891, as many as 441 cadets had joined the militia and 1670 the volunteers in five years.

The details of the only other cadet battalion which had been in existence for the same period, viz., the 1st Manchesters are not given in the Table, but the commanding officer, Colonel Ledward stated that he should judge that about 50 per cent. went into the volunteers and a great many into the army.

The Duke of Argyll in an article in the *Nineteenth Century* for July 1905 says:

"Abroad it is not considered sufficient to have compulsory service; the State takes especial care that the youths who are to be subjected to military service are enabled as boys to have their bodies strengthened for that service by physical exercises at school. If we are unfit for the patriotism which asks that all should serve in the defence forces when they are grown men, let us, at all events, see that the boyhood of our countrymen be not passed without the preparation necessary to make them fit when grown up to be thorough soldiers at short notice."

Among the strongest supporters of the voluntary training of youth in England is General Lord Methuen whose article in the *Nineteenth Century* for February 1905 might be transcribed *extenso*. He deals chiefly with the Lads' Drill Association and the Church Lads' Brigade, and quotes Lord Wolseley, Lord Roberts, Lord Rosebery, and the Association of Headmasters in support of the thesis that "Mental without physical training is a lop-sided experiment; there should be a curriculum of elementary training in all our schools. We ought to follow the example of our Colonies and introduce compulsory cadet corps."

Lord Dundonald writes: "Youth is the time for improvement, the season for preparation. A cadet therefore cannot too early be given the knowledge, the habits and the skill which fit him not only to perform his general duties as a good citizen, but also to take part at the proper time in his country's defence."

The views of Lord Meath have already been referred to. He holds that

"if training in youth were made universal, not only would the adult male be capable of taking his place in the ranks, but, what is of still greater importance almost, the spirit of patriotism and the sense of duty would be quickened in the nation, and in time of difficulty young men would rush to the ranks and compulsion would be unnecessary."

There is no more hopeful sign of the times than the formation of cadet corps in connection with nearly all our great public schools. The experience of Haileybury, Eton and Rugby are given in full in the report of the Royal Commission on Militia and

Volunteers, Volume I., Minutes of Evidence, pages 397 to 400, and 407 to 415.

Out of the Haileybury corps in 1893 numbering 76, 21 are officers in the army, 7 are officers in the auxiliary forces, and 3 served in the City Imperial Volunteers during the war.

Out of the Eton College corps in 1900 (about 500 strong), 25 are officers of the militia, 19 in the yeomanry, and 73 in the volunteers, besides those who have joined the regular army.

Out of the Rugby corps, with an establishment of 220, which however is exceeded at present, about a tenth, Captain Hawksworth judged, go into the regular army, and about another tenth into the auxiliary forces as officers. This officer thought that the lack of continuity between the cadet service and subsequent service was one of the principal reasons that their cadets did not find their way into the auxiliary forces.

The especial value of these corps is that they help to overcome one of the greatest difficulties of citizen soldiership, that of officers, of which they already contribute large quotas to the army, the militia, and the volunteers.

They are further of immense value as examples to minor schools, and if properly encouraged it might reasonably be hoped that no secondary school in Great Britain should be without its cadets.

In the smaller schools, several might unite in the formation of a cadet company to be affiliated to the local volunteer corps.

The masters of these schools whose desire is as keen as those of the great public schools to turn out *men*, not milksops, and many of whom have been selected for their positions on account of their athleticism, only in a secondary degree to their scholarship, would readily qualify as officers, the senior boys becoming non-commissioned officers.

With a view to the universal training of youth in military exercises and the use of the rifle, a cadet company should be formed in every volunteer battalion, for which the Government might well afford a small capitation allowance.

Even in the Boys' Brigade the youngsters contribute a yearly sum towards their equipment and the expenses of the annual week's camp, and the State might well undertake what is now accomplished by private subscription.

For such youths as the foregoing organisations in their fullest extensions do not provide, the course recommended is to fall back on a modified form of Sir G. Taubman-Goldie's scheme for national cadet schools as sketched in his report on the War in South Africa, p. 147.

Briefly, this scheme is:

"After two or three years interval, to allow of the perfecting of existing volunteer corps and the general creation of others throughout the country, every physically sound boy of seventeen years of age, not serving in the

navy or the merchant service, and unprovided with a certificate (from the appointed military authority) that he is an efficient member of a volunteer cadet corps would have to serve for a term in national cadet schools."

Sir G. Taubman is "convinced that the system would result in a great diminution of expenditure by permitting a large reduction of the men serving with the colours in the regular army as well as in many other ways."

Without maintaining that it would be possible to put this scheme into practice at once, it is submitted that this would be the readiest way of securing the male able-bodied youth of the country for service in the regular or auxiliary forces as existing, and for expanding these forces in time of war.

The labour of youths of seventeen is of no great practical value, as they would not be likely to be in permanent situations, there would, by a consensus of opinion, be less interruption to the trade and industry of the country by taking youths away at this age than at a later period when they might be an essential support of their families, and the physical good which a few months military training would do them would more than compensate for the temporary loss of wages it would entail on the working classes—or the interruption of their studies in the professional classes.

It is calculated that only a small residue of the male population would have been without some physical drill in the earlier portion of their lives, and that three or four months would be sufficient to instil into them the simpler portions of drill and how to handle a rifle. It is anticipated that such a training would be an incentive to perfect themselves in local shooting clubs as advocated by Lord Roberts, and that in this way the mass of the male population might become at least second-class shots.

It is hoped that such a system might act as a spur to recruiting both for the army and militia, and bring home to the nation at large the paramount and primary duty of national defence.

It should be a disgrace to any man not to take part in the defence of his country, and it is questionable whether the Parliamentary franchise might not equitably be refused to those who, through their own fault, fail to make themselves efficient to defend their hearths and homes.

P.S.—In any system of universal military training, Ireland under present conditions must be a difficulty. There is no race in the British Islands more imbued with the military spirit in all classes, none who more readily take to drill and everything connected with soldiering, or take a more genuine delight in fighting; and it can only be hoped when the land question is settled, and a peasant proprietary established the Irish people will see the advantage of the British connection, and will be as loyal as they are valiant subjects of the Crown.

F. Treffry.

THE DANGERS OF MEAT EATING.

EARTHQUAKES have their place in nature and sensations are not without value in influencing social reforms! The "Chicago sensation" and the "diseased meat scare" have had a greater effect in making the modern man think about his food than all the books and essays and tracts that have been written on the diet problem for the last twenty years.

All the quiet, patient work that has been going on for so long, has been slowly moulding men's minds, but it needed a sudden shock to crystallise its effect. This shock has come like a bolt from the blue and the vaunted excellencies of American meat industries are revealed as being the cloak for indescribable nastiness.

We are a selfish race and it is generally necessary to prick us in our own sore places before we are willing to make much progress. So long as Chicago was merely "the hell of the animals," it was a subject for mirth, and comic papers were always playing some variant or other upon "the squealing sausage" joke. Anti-vivisectors who held up pious hands of horror at the vivisection of a guinea pig under chloroform quietly ate their American dainties upon the plea that their stomachs were weak, and they refused to listen to the story of the inhuman degradations connected with the slaughter-house, upon the ground that the eating of meat was one of the pleasures that they did not wish to be deprived of—cost what it might in animal agony! But even selfishness has its uses, and what men and women will not do in answer to the pitiful plea of a groaning creation, they do without question when personal pain or personal health is concerned. And so at this moment the whole question of the dangers and the horrors and the unsavouriness of the meat-eating habit is prominently forward in men's minds.

One of the greatest hindrances to the careful and intelligent consideration of reform in dietary has been the follies and faddisms and general crankiness which has been connected with the vegetarian movement. Whenever I attempt to advocate the enormous advantages of a non-flesh dietary, I am always met with the rejoinder "Oh, but I couldn't become a vegetarian—vegetarians are such dreadful people," and my first step has always to be to teach them that they may give up the use of flesh food without becoming "horrid vegetarians." A right dietary is a scientific

matter and not one to be exploited by faddists, and, therefore, in drawing attention to the importance of the problems connected with the slaughtering and purveying animals for food I want to disassociate myself entirely from vegetarian organisations or from any sympathy with their methods or creeds.

The lesson of Chicago is not a new one to me. In a little book I wrote ten years ago on "Tuberculosis, or is Flesh Eating a Cause of Consumption?" I quoted facts from at home and abroad to show the dangers that essentially are connected with flesh as food.

Let me put my line of reasoning quite shortly and boldly.

Animals in domesticity suffer very largely from diseases of a more or less loathsome character.

A diseased animal is not healthy food for decent men and women. Whether the disease from which the animal may be suffering is actually communicable to man by ingestion or not is unimportant compared with the broad fact that a diseased animal is not decent food —even for a hyena, much less for a dainty woman or an artistic man.

Diseased animals are actually killed and sold and used in large numbers for human food.

Disease is such a subtle thing that it is quite impossible to detect it in a dead body without the most careful post-mortem examination of every bit of the internal organs. It is quite impossible to determine whether an animal is diseased by inspecting it before slaughter. It is exceedingly easy to remove the diseased portions of the internal organs after death before inspection. When the internal organs have once been removed it is quite impossible to say whether or not the animal was or was not diseased.

To make even an approximate approach to the elimination of diseased meat it would be necessary to inspect every animal before being slaughtered and put into quarantine every one that was noticeably unhealthy, and either to keep it under observation until quite well or to kill it and destroy the carcase. It would then be necessary to inspect every animal as it is killed in order to prevent the fraudulent removal of the internal organs. It would then be necessary to examine these organs in detail and to destroy (so far as human food is concerned) the bodies of animals whose organs were found unhealthy. And then, when you have done all this and have destroyed thousands of dead bodies which would otherwise have been eaten, you will have no assurance that the animal was not suffering from an early form of one of the most loathsome and malignant diseases the whole time.

Let me illustrate. A woman of wealth and position develops a lump in her breast. She submits herself to the most skilled physicians and surgeons. Money is no object. Time and talent are unstinted. Every attempt is made to determine exactly what is the nature of the tumour. In spite of all the consultations, it is not always possible to

be sure whether the lump is the result of local inflammatory processes of very little importance, or whether it is the local manifestation of the gravest disease which affects civilised humanity. It is decided to remove it for assurance. But even the tumour lying on the table, closely scrutinised and cut open by the most competent experts, does not always tell its tale, and it is necessary to take a section and mount it and examine it under a microscope before a definite decision can be arrived at. When there are cases of such difficulty, with every facility for observation and every faculty on the stretch to determine whether the verdict for the woman shall be life or death, how is it possible to suppose that a single inspector, having to examine carcase after carcase, could be sure of noticing, much less deciding upon, the character of a tumour in an animal? When it was alive, even the animal could not complain; and now that it is dead, the difficulties of discovery are tenfold.

If we think for a moment that there are 2800 oxen, 20,000 sheep, 5000 pigs (to say nothing of fowls, rabbits, and other creatures) killed daily in England, one recognises what a stupendous task it would be to examine each animal properly before it was allowed in the market!

If people think that it is easy to tell whether an animal is diseased by examining it before it is killed, they are very forgetful of the insidious character of disease. How many of us who have to deal with disease in men and women who can talk and detail their symptoms and complain of their pain, have been deceived! Again and again it happens that a patient goes to a doctor for what is apparently a trivial thing, to learn that an insidious disease has made such rapid internal progress that life is only a thing of months, or a year or so. How often, too, has a patient been to one doctor who has found nothing serious, and has gone to another one a month or two later and is found to be far gone in a dangerous disease! The first doctor would have an infinitely better chance of determining the presence of the disease than any market inspector of animals could do, and yet it is often quite impossible in the former case to discover the disease. We all know how the tuberculosis test showed that herds of the finest cattle, that were presumably in the most perfect health, were tainted with the great white plague.

We all know that continuous milking is a considerable strain upon an animal. When, however, the animal is turned into a machine, and the only object is to get the greatest amount of milk in the shortest possible time, the strain is so great that a large percentage begin to break down. What becomes of these anæmic and debilitated cows? Are they turned out to rest, or pensioned as a reward for their services? The curse of Mammon is too powerful for this. The plea of mercy may come in for the worn-out horse, but no one dreams of giving a quiet old age of rest to the mother cow. She is worth so many pounds as meat, and by the process of

stuffing with grains or oilcake, she can be made to put on flesh and fat, and then—the butcher's knife and the dinner-table!

I have visited the abattoirs at Deptford. I have inspected the killing of animals at many of the slaughter-houses of London and the country. I have watched the Jewish killers at work at Aldgate, and by village slaughtermen I have seen the last sad scenes enacted. It has been my lot in my medical work to have to pass through the Smithfield meat market at all hours of the day and night, and to see the carcases in all their stages of anatomising, and I have come to the conclusion that not one man in a thousand—who partakes with relish of his breakfast of bacon and Worcester sauce, or his light lunch off a chop or a couple of sausages, or his dinner from a round of beef or a fowl—has any idea of the preliminary stages which have been gone through before the cow grazing in the meadow, or the pig grunting in the sty, or the cock crowing in the early morning, has become the "piece of meat" on his plate!

I do not care to enumerate the charges that have been made against the administration of the abattoirs and food-canning industries of Chicago.

Some of them are too nauseous to repeat; some are palpable exaggerations; some are quite harmless in spite of their gruesome sound; but the substratum of them all is as applicable to England as it is to Chicago. I have no quarrel with the wild hunter killing the hardy animal on the open plains or in primæval forests, and eviscerating and cooking and eating it. The Red Indians are typical of this method of life. It is not conducive to mental progress or to spiritual development, and the constitutions produced by it are peculiarly subject to rheumatisms, and to the ravages of consumption when touched by civilisation, but none the less it is a comparatively healthy and artistic dietary upon which they feed.

A very different state of affairs is, however, found when animals are bred and fed in confinement and domesticity. Here the aim is not to get an animal with a hardy constitution, but one with a great weight of body and a frame which will carry the maximum of fat in the minimum of time. The market does not ask for hardy cattle, it demands "fat beasts"—and fat beasts are provided for it. Now abnormal fat is in itself an unhealthy condition, and an animal so fattened is not a healthy animal in the best sense of the word. But this abnormality is as nothing compared to the actually diseased animals that are knowingly foisted on the food market.

A farmer has a wasting cow. He is not a rich man. He cannot afford to lose five or ten pounds, so he does not kill the cow and bury the carcase, but he sets to work to temporarily fatten her and then promptly sends her to market. The butcher who buys her knows nothing of this history, which is so suggestive

of consumption, and so he buys her in all good faith. When she is killed the lungs and pleura show extensive tubercular disease. The butcher cannot afford to lose ten or fifteen pounds, so he strips out the pulmonary organs, cuts up the carcase, and sells it as "prime English meat." The customer buys it in all good faith, and takes it home and congratulates himself that he does not buy cheap American rubbish but only the best English killed meat! And as he carves the joint from the tuberculous cow he sings the song of the Pharisee and thanks God that he does not live in Chicago, but that Old England is his home and the roast beef of Old England is his food. And he wonders why consumption is such a dreadfully prevalent disease in the land.

And, lastly, I do not blame the butcher, because he has been taught that there is no harm in tuberculous meat, and he believes it and is willing to eat the carcase himself. I well remember when I read a paper on "Flesh Eating a Cause of Consumption" before the Sanitary Congress at Portsmouth, that two of our London medical officers of health—who are still medical officers of health for important London districts—opposed me on the ground that the flesh of tuberculous animals was excellent food and that they would advocate the use of all tuberculous and cancerous meat for the poor after submitting it in a public institution to a sufficiently high temperature! Even then it appears to me that it should be labelled "carcase of a cancerous cow" or "a potted measly pig" or "canned consumptive calf," or some title to enable poor people to know the sort of stuff which medical officers of health considered good food for them.

For myself I consider that the dangers connected with diseased animals are so great that under no circumstances should their bodies be used for food.

What, then, do I offer? To destroy is easy, to create is difficult.

What, then, do I present of a practical feasible character to replace a meat dietary?

That it is practicable and feasible I need only point to the Lady Margaret Fruitarian Hospital, Bromley, Kent, where neither patients, nurses, nor medical staff partake of any form of flesh food within the hospital. And the result of nearly four years working is excellent in the extreme. A fruitarian diet consists of the fruits of trees (like apples, oranges, bananas and olives), the fruits of bushes (like currants and raspberries), the fruits of plants (like strawberries and melons, lentils and beans and cucumbers), the fruits of grasses (like wheat and barley and maize and oats), the fruits of nut trees (from filbert to cocoa-nut), together with some earth fruits (like potatoes), and a modicum of vegetables and salads. To these may be added butter, milk, honey and cheese, although their production is not so free from risk of contamination and animal

infection as is the case with the products of the vegetable kingdom and the world of fruits. Grown under healthy conditions, with diseased specimens easy to detect and remove, it is far more possible to live healthily and well upon a fruitarian dietary than upon the products of the slaughter-house. The lesson of Chicago, therefore, is "look to your own food supply, and if you want the next generation to be sturdy and strong, and fit to carry on the great traditions of England's past and to rise to greater glories in the future feed them on healthy food and eliminate the elements of disease from the dietary." With a fruitarian dietary in its widest sense, I believe this to be possible; with a diet consisting largely of flesh foods I believe it to be impossible.

Josiah Oldfield.

THE LITERARY POSITION OF OSCAR WILDE.

MAETERLINCK has shown us in one of his admirable essays how impossible and how absurd it is to attempt to reconcile human affairs with the idea of an intelligent external justice impartially and invariably meting out good for good and evil for evil. All injustice springs originally from man himself or from what we are pleased to call Nature. The intelligence of Nature is purely mechanical; she has smiles and frowns for both moral and immoral alike, without regard to character or conduct. The "justice" or "injustice" of man is purely arbitrary, hence its seeming inexplicability. In no sense, perhaps, is the cruelty and caprice of human justice shown more painfully than in the history of literature. Here and there, scattered over the globe, we find lonely and unrecognised geniuses whose messages have faded and remain forgotten because no one has been found to appreciate or to understand them. And too often the fault lay, not in the message or its deliverer, but in the world. On the other hand we find writers (not always so deserving) concerning whose high position the world has spoken decisively. She has placed them on lofty pedestals. And those whom she chooses for this honour are usually the writers who have made a successful appeal to some strong force in human nature. They count their followers by millions; for they have a straightforward message for plain minds. True, in distant years their names may fade for ever to make room for other names bearing similar messages, but, whatever their ultimate fate be, they have at least the satisfaction of present glory and the supreme consolation of being understood by their fellows. In the contemplation of these darlings of public opinion we feel no pain; but, when we turn to the victims of that same public opinion, we cannot but feel angered at the grotesque caprice of human justice. Among the writers so rejected by the world there are some whom she has spurned simply because she has not troubled to understand them. Prominent among this mournful group is Oscar Wilde. Around that hapless man controversy incessantly played in the past and apparently will continue to play in the future. His whole literary work (plays, poems, essays, and fiction) in vain cried out for just criticism—

prejudice, misconception, and a strained sense of respectability refused it. His few admirers were dubbed a senseless clique dazzled by the showy glitter of his language. Wilde was always considered a mere "poseur." Fault was found with all his writings. It was said that his prose was disfigured by incongruous ornament; his poetry was a feeble echo of Keats and Swinburne. His wonderful essays — especially *The Decay of Lying* and *The Soul of Man* — were admired only for their peculiar brilliance; their inherent depths of philosophy was overlooked. His plays were deemed conventional in construction and overloaded with spurious wit. Great and undue stress was invariably laid on the man's eccentricities; in the public eye Wilde was only a witty fellow yearning for celebrity and capable of performing weird literary antics to attain that object. He is indeed a tragic figure. Laughed at in his youth, misunderstood in his maturity, spurned in his closing years, accused of plagiarism, blamed for his love of posture, constantly charged with artificiality, an object of unceasing attack from pulpit and press—in a word, roundly abused all his life—Wilde would seem to have small chance, in this country, at any rate, of literary fame. Long before the catastrophe of 1895 he had an extraordinary amount of prejudice against him. His downfall was the crowning condemnation. After that it looked as though he were indeed doomed to an eternal outer darkness. And yet, leaving the question of his conduct on one side, his sole fault was simply his unswerving fidelity to his own intellectual bias. He could not write about ordinary things in an ordinary way. He could not present the British public with its favourite dish of love and sport. He was incapable of moulding his maxims on traditional conceptions of virtue and vice. It was, perhaps, inevitable that the uneducated British public should turn its back on one who at almost every opportunity flaunted in its face the most unusual doctrines. For it must be confessed, Oscar Wilde enunciated doctrines utterly alien to the ingrained Puritanism and athleticism of English people. The man who runs counter to national traditions and prejudices is bound to provoke bitter hostility. The man who, in this country, places art before muscle or sets the individual will above the conventional law, seems sure sooner or later to come to grief. Yet, in spite of his unpopularity, Wilde was never discouraged. Borne up by his own motto, "To be great is to be misunderstood," he moved steadily forward, and made his mark. True, his influence was limited to the very few, but it existed and will expand further in the time to come. The unconventional will always thank him for his unflinching advocacy of things unconventional. The artist will remember him because he was one of the courageous few who helped to remove English theories of art

from the tyranny of rigid tradition to the freedom of unfettered originality. He may have been rash, he may have been inclined to pose, his writings may show traces of plagiarism—an innocent sort of plagiarism that is almost a transformation—but there was always a thoroughness about his work which certainly deserved fairer consideration. To the average English mind his doctrines could only suggest the bizarre and the unnatural; but that was because the English mind had not yet learnt to appreciate an oblique point of view. Not that Wilde's outlook was always unusual. On the contrary, some of his short stories—especially *The Happy Prince*, *The Star-child*, and *The Model Millionaire*—though necessarily tinted with his peculiar colouring, would satisfy the most exacting moralist by their tone of "poetic justice." If Wilde occasionally trampled on cherished national convictions or sometimes thrust strangely-hued flowers amongst our soberer blossoms, it was not from love of opposition; it was rather because he had to drift whither his fantastic and exuberant intellect listed.

Wilde's descent into the abyss seemed at the time to be the death-blow to what little influence he had already gained. The hasty verdict of a rather superficial morality said then that his influence must have been essentially unhealthy. From that time to the publication of *De Profundis* it was even deemed a breach of manners to allude to Wilde in any way. However, that interesting posthumous book has been the cause ef a partial change of the public attitude. We are once more allowed to discuss Wilde's book without hearing a shocked "hush," or being suspected of loose views on moral matters. Whatever one's opinion may be as to the genuineness of the repentance shown in *De Profundis*, one may at any rate be deeply thankful for what it has undoubtedly done toward the rehabilitation of its author. He is no longer under a ban. He may eventually receive a high place in English literature. After all, his admitted writings cannot fairly be deemed unhealthy. Those who see "an undercurrent of nasty suggestion" in some of his literary productions must surely be so obsessed by their knowledge of his unfortunate behaviour as to lose all power of disconnecting two absolutely independent things, namely, his art and his private life. The ludicrous charges of immorality brought against that book of painted words and lordly language, *Dorian Gray*, fall to the ground at once when it is known that the book was written solely for money. As Mr. Sherard says in his *Life of Oscar Wilde*, no author would risk the financial success of a book by filling it with immoral teachings. The marvel to me is that Wilde managed to produce such a transcendent work of art under the pressure of such a prosaic stimulus.

In the past, before his downfall, Wilde's works were only read

carefully by a select few. Others, it is true, granted a certain momentary admiration to his prose, but it was the sort of admiration involuntarily and temporarily evoked by gorgeous fireworks rather than the lasting admiration felt for a permanent object of art. Now, if justice is to be done to any author's work the impersonal attitude is imperative. The intellectual reader must sink his personal predilections, he must not keep asking himself whether he agree with this or that sentiment expressed by an author. It is not very hard to do. There are minds which dislike stories packed with scenes of love, but such minds need not on that account be debarred from appreciating the almost faultless love-scenes in *Richard Feverel.* Of course, when the reader is by nature in perfect accord with the writer's sentiments, the enjoyment will be fuller and more satisfactory than when his appreciation be acquired, but in both cases the object of the writer's genius will have been attained. In the case of Wilde's works there is a real necessity for impartiality of standpoint, because only the few are by nature and inclination in tune with his work. The majority must learn to put themselves into tune. Two difficulties—broadly speaking—hamper anything like a general and intelligent recognition of Wilde's genius. The first is undoubtedly the moral obliquity or seeming moral obliquity revealed by the criminal trial of 1895. The second is the lack of effort or ability to understand Oscar Wilde's trend of thought. Would that the former might be for ever forgotten! After all, his writings are of vastly more importance to posterity than his private conduct. The stolid Englishman, however, finds it hard to differentiate between a man's private character and his books. Certain unfortunate impressions received in 1895 cloud his honest judgment in the matter of Wilde's position in literature. Now this is not the place to discuss the pathological aspect of Oscar Wilde's conduct, but I may be permitted to say that his restitution—to be permanent—must depend on a fuller knowledge of an obscure branch of morbid pathology.

This at present, for obvious reasons, is impossible. No doubt *De Profundis* with its confession of humility and its partial admission of error will impress many minds favourably, but the more matter of fact minds care little whether that book be entirely sincere or merely a huge pose intended to transform public opinion. What they do care about is a *locus standi* based on sound scientific grounds. Once such a basis be generally accepted, perhaps the worst obstacle to the recognition of Wilde will have been taken away. Let it be admitted that Wilde erred greatly; then charity reminds us that there is such a thing as forgiveness of sin. Let it be granted that pathological research will explain and even excuse much of his conduct; common-sense will then bid us banish our rigid prudery and consign once and for all to oblivion what really

has absolutely nothing to do with our unchecked contemplation of a great artist.

The other obstacle to an unbiassed conception of this writer's productions is not so easily defined as that just discussed, for the latter sprang into existence at a definite time, whilst this one had existed ever since Wilde published his first book of poems. From the beginning Wilde's ideas were diametrically opposed to all our eminently respectable British traditions of art. The reading world failed to grasp his meaning. And that was mainly due to what one may call our national inability to understand a creed whose keynote was the worship of beauty. We are, above all, a stolid race, in no way over-attracted by beauty; we certainly love personal cleanliness and comfort, but it is a cleanliness derived from cold water rather than from warm, and a comfort obtained from blankets and brick rather than from silks and marble. We cannot see the use of any one's making a fuss of a beautiful thing simply because of its beauty. Such a proceeding savours to us of lunacy or idolatry. And when Wilde, in 1881, burst upon our sober minds with his first book of poems—saturated as it was with a lavish reckless admiration of beauty—we felt that here indeed was a strange apostle teaching a still stranger cult. Coming, as this book did, on the heels of Wilde's æsthetic campaign—after all, but as pardonable youthful extravagance, and, as, Mr. Sherard points out, completely cured by that American tour, which taught a needed practical lesson—there was, perhaps, some reason for its hostile reception. "Here is a man," said the critics, "who values all glittering evanescence of a coloured bubble above morality itself." This sweeping opinion represented the belief of many critics at that time, and, unfortunately for Wilde, later events seemed confirmatory. In one sense possibly Wilde did set beauty above morality, but it was above the conventional conception of morality—that is something arbitrary and too often uncharitable—*not* above goodness. In any case, one must not base one's conception of Wilde's attitude towards morality on anything which he has written. Some men do, indeed, project their own personalities into their books, in spite of Wilde's splendid dictum: "To reveal art and to conceal the artist is the true aim of art. The artist can express everything." But one may be confident that the author of *Dorian Gray* has been guilty of no such literary soul-dissecting. An intimate friend of his—a man, perhaps, more fitted to speak authoritatively on this subject than any other man living—told me that Wilde only revealed *one* aspect of his own character in his books, and that not the most attractive aspect.

Read in the clear light of intelligent criticism, the first book of poems teaches only one thing, namely, that here is an author almost unique in his whole-hearted worship of form and colour, a worship, too, that is not casual, capricious, and superficial, but

serious, terribly serious, and thoroughly healthy. Of course, all this was horribly unpractical, and most Englishmen, with their innate dislike of "hollow beauty," shrugged their shoulders. Wilde, in his first as in his later efforts, wrote only for minds attuned to his. Others must take the right attitude or else pass on elsewhere.

Wilde has plainly this to his credit that he never tried to win the public, never debased the art of literature by pandering to any popular movement. Of that exquisite set of allegories *The House of Pomegranates* he finely said (in answer to some mystified critics) that "it was intended neither for the British child nor for the British public." Indeed, some think that much, if not all, of his work was the accidental, irresponsible, yet irresistible overflow of an ever creative intellect, and not literature written with any definite purpose. On this question, however, it is better to keep an open mind.

Wilde had an inherent horror of the commonplace, and this seems to have led him occasionally into a rather strained effort after a rather petty kind of originality. Of course his numerous enemies laid hold of that habit and made it the foundation of a great deal of silly abuse. Frivolous, frothy remarks put into the mouths of some of Wilde's characters were solemnly quoted as part of Wilde's creed. Witty repartees deliberately torn from their proper context in his plays were seriously construed as Wilde's own gospel. The words of few men have undergone such distortion and misinterpretation as have those of this genius. One can only be thankful that now at any rate there are signs of the advent of Truth, there are signs of a strong fresh breeze sweeping away those murky mists and grotesque masks that have so long hidden the real Wilde. It is at last dawning on men's minds that his writings are not so much external ornament concealing a blank void, and that his wit is often wisdom, only occasionally nonsense. Some critics say that Wilde's art may be very entertaining and very clever, but that (with the exception of *De Profundis*) it leads us nowhere. But is that, even if true, a sound objection to his work? For some people, at any rate, it is refreshing to step aside from the hustle and bustle of literary missionaries and to enjoy a healthy rest with an author who does not burden his readers with any tedious lesson. As a matter of fact, whether Wilde had any fixed aim or not, his work most certainly points—and points clearly—to a definite goal. I think that there are those who will say that they have been led by this author to very fruitful regions. If some people feel that Wilde only takes them a giddy dance over tracts of glittering but useless beauty, there are others who feel that his restless flights helped them to realise the wonder of much that previously seemed common and graceless. What, pray, are many of Wilde's short stories, such as the *Young*

King and *The Happy Prince*, but artistically embroidered pleas for social reform? Who can read *Dorian Gray* intelligently without hearing the deep bass note of doom at first faint, but gradually growing louder and louder amid the brilliant cascade of frivolous treble notes till it drowns them in the final crash of just punishment for error? Can any one fail to note the stern moral lesson of *Salome?* Who can study his other plays carefully without learning the superb philosophy of human life that runs through them like a silver thread amid a many-hued skein? And who can help observing the high aspirations which lift so much of his verse out of the sphere of mere decorated rhyme? The truth is, Wilde's work bristles with moral advice, but—partly owing to his own oft-repeated condemnation of stories with a moral, and partly owing to the innate obtuseness of most of his readers—it is constantly overlooked.

In the early nineties Wilde's position was almost unique; he was looked upon as a literary phenomenon defying satisfactory solution. His art bewildered, amazed, repelled; if a few here hailed him as worthy to rank with intellectual giants, a multitude there said his art was unreal, frothy, and sometimes dangerous. He was a kaleidoscope puzzle even to his own friends. This is shown by the impressions of him recorded by various personal friends; they all seemed to see a different man: none of their presentations agree. Still, Wilde kept on his way gyrating giddily onward. His art must sooner or later bear fruit and find its home; such ability could not be destined to be wasted. Then, just as he seemed on the point of grasping honour and glory, there came in his career that fatal crisis, the one bright spot in which was, perhaps, that it saved him from worse things. Prison life steadied him. It helped him to take a fuller, broader view of life, to recognise how incomplete had been his former life when it confined itself to the enjoyment of this world's splendour and refused to acknowledge or share in the world's sorrow. In the quiet of his cell he could write the pleading, passionate prose afterwards given us as *De Profundis*. This book has struck the public imagination. And to me, of all the puzzling problems connected with the unfortunate Oscar Wilde, none is so inexplicable as this. A book, the keynote of which is an abject almost grovelling humility, has captivated the hearts of a people whose chief characteristics are sturdiness and independence of character. It may seem a dreadful statement, but if I were asked to name any book by Wilde that was not quite healthy in tone, I should promptly mention *De Profundis*. At the same time, I should hasten to add that the unhealthy part of the book was the unavoidable outcome of the author's terrible position. The crushed must needs be very humble.

But, apart from that one demoralising note of excessive humility, *De Profundis* is a splendid progression of noble thoughts leading in

very truth from the dank gutter to the gleaming stars. The price paid for its evolution by the author was awful, but, as a writer said recently in the *Hibbert Journal*, it may have been absolutely necessary. Both this book and *A Ballad of Reading Gaol* fill the gaps left in Oscar Wilde's earlier work—gaps which might have remained empty but for his downfall. Neither of these books is, perhaps, any real advance (from a purely literary point of view) on his former work. But because they are both serious, both more in accordance with the tastes of the "man in the street," they have effected a considerable change in the public attitude. It would be safe to say that Wilde's literary position was never less insecure than at the present time. The favourable reception awarded to his last two books has opened the door to a more sensible and fairer examination of all his books. And that is all we admirers of Wilde's genius demand. The rest —the eventual granting to Wilde of a niche in the temple of English literature—will follow in due course. Some of his work already smacks of "the day before yesterday," it is true; but much of it is imperishable, capable of standing the test of ages. Much of it represents some of the finest prose-poetry in our language. Oscar Wilde was our *one* English artist in words.

At length a turning-point has been reached. Oscar Wilde is once more on trial, but it is a trial whose result can involve no disgrace, but which may—surely will—bring him a radiant wreath of fame. It will last long, for there is a strong array of witnesses on either side, and there is much up-hill work for his advocates. The scarlet flame of his disgrace still throws a lurid light on all his literary works, but it has begun to grow paler and smaller, and ere long it may become extinct, and in its place will dazzle forth the jewelled light of his undying intellect, teaching our descendants about the eternity of beauty and joy, but bidding them never forget the temporary reign of pain and sorrow, beseeching them to sweep away the tainted refuse that hides the crystal purity below, asking them for justice. And will not these requests be granted? On the Continent, in America, the great awakening has begun; there, the genius has triumphed over the convict, the sinner has been lost in the artist. Must it be said, then, by a later generation that Britain alone never forgave the strange errors of one of her brightest thinkers, but was content to let foreign hands raise him and his from the mire? Surely no; surely we are not so rich in intellectual wealth that we can afford to pass *any* of our artists by "on the other side."

Anyhow, when the haze of Time has finally covered all trace of the human frailties of Oscar Wilde, his genius, now slowly forcing its way upward through many a clogging obstacle, will rise resplendent and glorious before the eyes of an understanding posterity.

Wilfrid M. Leadman.

HENRY KIRKE WHITE.

THE MARTYR-STUDENT.

> "Oh! what a noble heart was here undone,
> When Science' self destroyed her favourite son."
> —BYRON.

THE present year is the centenary of the death of him whose name stands at the head of this page. Poor Kirke White! Such are the words that involuntarily rise to the lips of any one who thinks or speaks of the brief career of this young Cambridge scholar and poet. It is largely the thought of what "might have been" that invests that white boyish brow, on which Death had long waited to set his seal, with a halo of almost unearthly glory. And when, in addition, we consider his gentle disposition, his simple piety, his rigid self-denial, his lofty aims, his unwearied devotion to work, there is hardly any element of sadness that is wanting to the tragic picture.

The thought of what "might have been," but now can never be, is one with which we are all familiar—it is a common-place lament of preachers and poets. So the poet Gray, pacing the churchyard at Stoke Poges (or, as some have fancied, at our own Cambridge Madingly), and musing amid the mouldering heaps, where

> "Each in his narrow cell for ever laid,
> The rude forefathers of the hamlet sleep,"

thought how the sod might cover the unfulfilled prowess of many a nameless warrior, the unfledged genius of many a Statesmen, scholar, and poet, and was saddened by the reflection that Death had laid his icy touch on

> "Hands that the rod of empire might have swayed,
> Or waked to ecstasy the living lyre."

So Virgil lamented the early death of Marcellus in lines of matchless beauty (perhaps the most beautiful in the whole *Æneid*), which he recited before the Empress Octavia with such effect that

> "The burning passion of his utterance made
> The Imperial Mother swoon
> With sweet and sharp of sorrow, as it bade
> The purple flowers be strewn,

And lavish lilies heaped upon the head,
Withdrawn as soon as shown;—
The very voice of beauty and of art,
Where yet so strangely ring
Those under-tones of tears that are a part
Of every mortal thing."

So our late Laureate dedicated the choicest flowers of his Muse to the memory of his boyhood's idolised and idealised friend, Arthur Hallam. So Lord Byron, in his tributary verses in eulogy of the subject of this present sketch, wrote

"Unhappy White! while life was in its spring,
And thy young Muse just waved her joyous wing,
The spoiler came, and all thy promise fair
Has sought the grave to sleep for ever there."

Henry Kirke White, the son of a butcher at Nottingham, was born on March 21, 1785, and died on October 19, 1806. Thus he was only in his twenty-second year, and may, therefore, well be regarded as one of the most remarkable examples in the history of literary men, of a youth cut off on the very threshold of manhood, with his education uncompleted, and all the fond dreams of literary ambition unaccomplished, and yet leaving behind him a reputation which the least appreciative critic can hardly call wholly ephemeral or evanescent.

His origin, like that of Chatterton and Burns, was humble. The occupation of his father was not one likely to be associated with culture or refinement; but probably he owed much to his mother, whose maiden name was Neville. From his third to his fifth year he was placed under the care of Mrs. Garrington, who kept a preparatory school. Even at that infantile age his extraordinary capacity and singular fondness for reading attracted the notice of his teacher. He seems to have been in every sense a precocious child, and has been not inaptly compared to a tender hot-house plant, which forced into premature bloom is destined to as swift a decay.

In his poem on "Childhood," written when only thirteen (and indeed, it is astonishing how many of his extant poems were written early in his teens) he pourtrays with lively, though boyish touches, some of the incidents of his earliest years:

"In yonder cot, along whose mouldering walls,
In many a fold the mantling woodbine falls,
The village matron kept her little school,
Gentle of heart, yet knowing well to rule.
Here first I entered, though with toil and pain,
The lowly vestibule of learning's Fane.

. . . . .

First in the form, my task for ever true,
A little favourite rapidly I grew;

And oft she stroked my head with fond delight,
Held me a pattern to the dunce's sight;
And as she gave my diligence its praise,
Talked of the honours of my future days."

He used to listen with avidity to the nursery tales with which the good dame delighted to stir his early imagination:

"Then first I shed bold Fancy's thrilling tear,
Then first high poesy charmed mine infant ear."

When the lad was about six he was placed at the school of the Rev. John Blanchard. When he was about eleven it is said that he one day wrote a separate theme for every boy in his class. The master said that the productions of the whole form were better than he had ever seen before, and the young author must have listened with secret satisfaction to the commendation bestowed on each supposed writer as he went up to the master's desk. One of the ushers acted in a very malicious way towards young White, who wrote a series of lampoons on the tyrant. These, however, have not come down to us.

Another early poem we possess, perhaps the very earliest of all, was written in his thirteenth year, on being confined to school on a Spring morning:

"Now the lark with upward flight
Gaily ushers in the light;
But for me no songster sings,
For me no joyous lark upsprings;
For I, confined in gloomy school,
Must own the pedant's iron rule.

. . . .

How gladly would my soul forego
All that arithmeticians know
Or stiff grammarians quaintly teach,
Or all that industry can reach,
To taste each morn of all the joys
That with the laughing sun arise."

His father still persisted in the wish to bring him up to his own trade, but the boy disliking this, and having no greater taste for the manufacture of stockings which was next proposed for him, was ultimately placed in an attorney's office, in the month of May or June, 1799. His letters to his brother Neville give us some idea of his industry at this time. He used to spend twelve hours a day in the office, and then devote one hour to Latin. Sometimes he underwent severer exertions. On one occasion when his employers had a troublesome case on hand he went without food for thirty-one hours. In 1800 he tells his brother that he is reading with attention *Blackstone*, *Knox's Essays*, *Plutarch*, *Chesterfield's Letters*, *Virgil*, *Homer*, and *Cicero*. He had already finished Rollins' *Ancient*

History, Blair's *Lectures*, Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, and other subjects. At the same time he was, he tells us, "with a little drudgery" studying Italian, French, Spanish and Portugese, and was "very busy with essays and poems for the *Monthly Preceptor*."

The last sentence requires a word of explanation. The *Monthly Preceptor*, a provincial periodical, had offered medals and prizes for the best replies to certain questions proposed. He was tempted to try his literary powers, and was fortunate in securing the coveted reward. He soon afterwards became a regular contributor to that periodical, and acquired the friendship of his first literary patron—its Editor—and through him was introduced to other scholars. Some of these induced him in 1802, when he was in his seventeenth year, to publish a volume of poems. It was his hope that this publication might either by the success of its sale, or the notice which it might excite, enable him to prosecute his studies at a university. He was advised, if possible, to secure some patroness for his work, whose rank or reputation might afford some material recommendation. The Countess of Derby was asked, and declined to lend her name. It was subsequently dedicated to the Duchess of Devonshire, but this did little for the poet, and the reviews of the book itself were not very favourable. The bitterness of the *Monthly Review* gained the young writer the friendship of Southey, who afterwards became his able biographer.

But a change in the young poet's life was now approaching. From infancy he had been troubled with a slight deafness, and the increase of this infirmity made him despair of achieving much ultimate success as a lawyer. It was about this time, too, that he first felt that earnest desire which only increased with his years, of entering the Church. Some kind friends exerted themselves on his behalf, and a sum of money was raised sufficient to procure him entrance as a sizar at St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1804.

Who may say with what honourable ambitions and noble aspirations he went up to the first scientific university of the land? But the young student was destined for a very brief academic career. For him no future was in store wherein to realise those fruits which he fondly dreamed of as the result of his talents and the reward of his toil.

Immediately before going to Cambridge he had greatly taxed his strength by over-study, in the little village of Wilford, on the banks of the Trent, and at the foot of Clifton Woods. These woods were a favourite place of resort, and were the subject of one of his longest poems. In this little retreat he threw himself heart and soul into his studies, allowing himself no time for recreation, little for his meals, and less for sleep. He would read till one, two, or three o'clock in the morning, then throw himself on his bed, and rise

again at five at the call of his alarum. Many nights he never lay down at all. It was in vain that his mother implored him to desist from such suicidal study. In this point alone was he ever undutiful. At one time she went every night to his room to put out his candle. As soon as he heard her coming upstairs he threw it into a cupboard and himself on to the bed in feigned sleep, and then when all was quiet he would rise again and resume his harmful studies. Whilst at Wilford it seemed doubtful whether his means would admit of his going to college, and deeming his hopes were blasted, he penned the beautiful but melancholy "Lines written in Wilford churchyard," as well as the "Ode to disappointment." However, as we have seen, the zeal and liberality of his friends secured the accomplishment of his most ardent longing, and with the seeds of consumption already sown and beginning to strike root in his fragile frame, he took up his residence at Cambridge.

Let us hurry over the brief and bitter story of that sadly short but strikingly sublime university career. No sooner had he entered college than his health gave way, and he had to go down for a year. This period he spent at Winteringham in the house of a clergyman named Grainger. There he gave himself up to constant study, chiefly classical and theological subjects, as well as to visiting among the poor of the parish.

He returned to Cambridge in October 1805, and began to read with an ardour that his feeble health could but ill sustain. He was encouraged to try for the University Scholarships the following January, and, besides this, in itself a sufficient stimulus for his nervous energy, there was the College examination at the end of the term, in which it was of great importance to his future prospects that he should take a good place. This he succeeded in doing, though suffering intensely, and only kept up "by strong stimulants and supporting medicines" during a six days' examination, as he tells his friend Benjamin Maddock in a letter. At the close of the examination he was pronounced the first man of his year, and he retired from the scene of his triumph, it may literally be said, to die. To compete for the University Scholarships, he now felt, was beyond his power, though he was able not only to renew his studies the following term, but to achieve new honours, for he was again pronounced first man at his College examination.

From this time his life presents a dreary picture of a restless, aspiring genius, struggling manfully, yet vainly, against that fatal consumption which he well knew was slowly wasting him away. He said to an intimate friend almost the last time he saw him, that were he to paint a picture of Fame crowning a distinguished undergraduate after the Senate House examination, he would represent her as concealing a Death's head under a mask of beauty.

One day, in July, he says: "I rose early and got up some rather

abstruse problems in mechanics for my tutor, spent an hour with him between eight and nine, got my breakfast, and read the Greek History (at breakfast) till ten; then sat down to decypher some logarithm tables. I think I had not done anything at them before I lost myself." He had fallen in a fit. From the effects of this he rallied, and for the rest of July and during August his health was somewhat improved, and he writes cheerfully. But in September he rapidly became weaker, though as late as October 11 he does not appear to have apprehended any immediate danger, for in a letter to his brother, found in his pocket after his death, he speaks hopefully of recovery. In a few days, however, this brother Neville was hastily summoned, and on the 19th the patient sufferer passed away.

Thus died poor Kirke White, in the twenty-second year of his age, when the brightest prospects seemed opening before him, and the highest literary honours were well within his grasp. When we remember that his poems were the production of a youth in his teens, and mostly written in moments snatched from those intense studies which enabled the self-taught scholar to compete with and to conquer the picked champions of our principal public schools, we may well feel regret never to have seen the matured fruits of a genius which we can only gauge by its early promise.

Kirke White was buried in the Chancel of All Saints Church, Cambridge (now removed), just opposite St. John's College, and on the site of the old church there still stands the stone inscribed with the initials which marks his grave.

Kirke White's character was singularly high and exalted. In him the highest intellectual powers were united with, and spiritualised by, the most genuine piety. In his early years he was somewhat inclined to scepticism. It was not possible that a youth of his ardent and inquiring mind could escape those reflections on the soul, the nature of God, and the conception of a future state, which force themselves on every one in moments of serious introspection. The result of his meditations was an unqualified acquiescence in the spirit as well as in the doctrines of Christianity. A prominent feature in his character, one which cannot fail to strike even the cursory reader of his poems, is his profound melancholy.

Poets often affect an unnatural melancholy, but the sadness that hung like a funeral-pall over Kirke White was of a different texture to the flimsy fustian worn by such charlatans of song. How could he be otherwise but melancholy (though he was never a complainer or a pessimist) with his proud and sensitive nature, his straitened circumstances, his many reverses, and his frail health? In his "Ode to Genius" he says:

> "Thou gavest him with treble force to feel
> The sting of keen neglect, the rich man's scorn,

And what o'er all does in his soul preside
Predominant, and tempers him to steel,
His high indignant pride."

Then, too, it was increased by the conviction that his genius was destined to be extinguished in premature death. What could be more pathetic than these lines "written in the prospect of death."?

"All, all save me sink in forgetfulness!
I only wake to watch the sickly taper
That lights me to my tomb."

Or these from the poem on "Solitude"?

"Yet in my dreams a form I view,
That thinks of me and loves me too:
I start, and when the vision's flown
I weep that I am all alone."

He has left a terribly effective fragment of an address to "Consumption," which begins:

"O thou most fatal of Pandora's train,
Consumption, silent cheater of the eye."

He also has a sonnet on the same subject, and in the same strain he wrote a weird and ghastly drama, in which occurs "a dance of the consumptives" to the lilt of this piteous strain:

"Come let us speed our way,
Join our hands and spread our tether!
I will furnish food for thee,
Thou shalt smooth the way for me,
And the grass shall wave
Over many a grave
Where youth and beauty sleep together."

His "Ode to Disappointment" is one of the finest of all his poems.

The first and last stanzas are well-known and generally admired:

"Come, Disappointment, come
Not in thy terrors clad!
Come in thy meekest, saddest guise,
Thy chastening rod but terrifies
The restless and the bad.
But I recline
Beneath thy shrine,
And round my brow resigned thy peaceful cypress twine.

. . . . .

"Come, Disappointment, come;
Thou art not stern to me;
Sad Monitress, I own thy sway,
A votary sad in early day
I bend my knee to thee.
From sun to sun
My race will run,
I only bow and say, My God, Thy will be done!"

Lastly, his melancholy was still further increased by the bitterness of disappointed or misplaced love. We have not space to enter this subject. All that can now be ever known may be gathered from his letters. In the poem "To Fanny" he writes:

"Sainted maid!
My thoughts oft rest with thee in thy cold grave,
Through the long wintry night, when wind and wave
Rock the dark house where thy poor head is laid.
Yet, hush! my fond heart, hush! there is a shore
Of better promise; and I know at last,
When the long Sabbath of the tomb is past,
We two shall meet in Christ to part no more."

Devoted student of books though Kirke White was, he had yet a keen eye for the beauties of Nature. In his lines "To an early primrose" there is one verse that well deserves quoting:

"Thee when young Spring first questioned Winter's sway,
And dared the sturdy blusterer to the fight—
Thee on this bank he threw,
To mark his victory!"

In the same way he has appreciative lines on "The harvest moon" and "The herb Rosemary." It is not perhaps generally known that Waller's famous lyric, "Go, lovely rose," as usually printed, owes its last stanza to H. K. White. A Cambridge lady lent Waller's poems to our poet, and he returned the volume with an additional stanza written by him at the bottom of the song, and his initials subscribed. This stanza has now become a part of the poem, and its source forgotten or unacknowledged. The stanza, it is perhaps unnecessary to say, reads as follows:

"Yet though thou fade,
From thy dead leaves let fragrance rise,
And teach the maid
That Goodness Time's rude hand defies,
That Virtue lives when Beauty dies."

His "Christiad," written in Spenserian stanzas, is perhaps his most finished work, and is highly rated by Southey. He also wrote several hymns, of which the best-known (found after his death written on the back of one of his examination papers) is the one that begins:

"Oft in danger, oft in woe,
Onward, Christians, onward go."

It is still very popular, and in universal use. It may be mentioned however, that the first line as originally written, ran:

'*Much* in sorrow, oft in woe."

Kirke White also wrote the evening hymn, "O Lord, another day is flown." On the whole, however, Kirke White must be judged by his promise rather than his performance, and cannot be placed in the front rank of poets. It is absurd to compare him, as many have done, with Keats, who in poetical genius was far, very far, above him.

What Kirke White most excels in besides simple and easy description of natural scenery, is in the delineation of his own personal sensibility and sadness. And furthermore, though he might never have become a really great poet, we cannot doubt that he would have become a really first-rate scholar. Even amongst poets, considering the early age at which he died, he holds an honoured place, and few are more worthy to be held in remembrance, whether for purity and nobility of character, for indomitable industry, or for accurate and comprehensive knowledge.

To the members of St. John's College, near whose portals he lies at rest, he has left the imperishable memory of a sleepless, solitary student outwatching the stars through many a dreary night, racked with pain of mind and body, eager to develope all his talents, ever athirst for knowledge, and never in his darkest hours losing hope, or falling from his fearless faith in a Divine Providence that ordereth all things aright.

As observed before, Kirke White was buried in the old church of All Saints, Cambridge. The church has now been removed, but a memorial cross marks the spot. The site is often visited by enthusiastic admirers, especially Americans. One of these, Mr. Boot, of Boston, erected a tablet to his memory, adorned with a medallion, and inscribed with some lines from the pen of Professor Smith, of which these form a part:

"Warmed with fond hope and learning's sacred flame,
To Granta's bowers the youthful poet came.
Unconquered powers the immortal mind displayed,
But, worn with anxious thought, the frame decayed.
Pale o'er his lamp, and in his cell retired,
The martyr-student faded, and expired.

. . . . . .

Far o'er the Atlantic wave
A wanderer came, and sought the poet's grave;
On yon low stone he saw the lonely name,
And raised this fond memorial to his fame."

J. HUDSON.

THE PROGRESS OF LEGAL PROTECTION TO ANIMALS.

It is more than probable that before the present Parliament has run its course several Statutes will have been added to those already in force dealing with the subject of Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. One of the first, no doubt, will be a "Spurious Sports Bill," which would be likely to receive a considerable amount of support from the present House. It may be of interest, then, to pass in brief review the various measures dealing with the subject in order to see where we stand to-day with regard to preventing unnecessary suffering to animals. And, as far as the letter of the law is concerned, no doubt we have gone far, the main difficulty being to administer it in a sympathetic spirit.

Rapid as has been the growth in recent years of Statutory enactments dealing with the protection of animals, the principle that cruelty towards them should be treated as an offence against the law is of comparatively modern origin, and one that was not admitted without considerable hesitation. The humane spirit which was much in evidence in the writings of Bentham and others of the Utilitarian School towards the close of the eighteenth century extended to animals, and gradually made itself a force in politics.

> "It ought to be lawful to kill animals but not to torment them . . . . why should the law refuse its protection to any sensitive being? The time will come when humanity will extend its mantle over everything which breathes. We have begun by attending to the condition of slaves, we shall finish by softening that of all animals which assist our labours, or supply our wants."

So writes Bentham in his "Principles of Penal Law," and the duty of humanity towards the inferior animals is often insisted upon in his works. It is true that during the Commonwealth bull and bear baiting and other popular sports of a similar kind were prohibited, but this was mainly because indulgence in them was held to encourage disorderly habits inimical to the welfare of the State. Macaulay, indeed, states that they were prohibited not because they gave pain to the animal, but because they gave pleasure to the spectators. However this may be, we take a long leap to the year 1781, when penalties were imposed for over-driving cattle within

the cities of London and Westminster. Fines were also imposed on persons other than drivers who should pelt cattle with stones. Cruelty, however, was only one among other mischiefs to be prevented.

In 1822 another Act imposed penalties on persons cruelly beating, abusing, or ill-treating horses, sheep, oxen, and other cattle; and bullock hunting and the like being still prevalent in spite of the Act of 1781, another measure was passed in 1833, which increased the penalties and extended the powers and provisions of the Act to within five miles of Temple Bar. Fines were also imposed on persons who kept or managed premises or places "for the purpose of fighting or baiting of bears, cock-fighting, baiting or fighting of badgers or other animals" within five miles of Temple Bar. A couple of years later the duty of preventing cruelty as such is plainly set forth. Cock-fighting, dog-fighting, and the baiting of bulls, bears and badgers were prohibited universally in places set apart for these sports, and the protection of the law was extended to any other animal whether of domestic or wild nature. The impounder of cattle was also required to provide sufficient food for them. Whereas diseased, old, and worn-out horses sold to knackers or slaughtermen for the purpose of slaughter had been frequently resold, or compelled to work, or kept without sufficient food, the Act of 1833 provided that such horses were to be killed within three days after purchase, and in the meantime were to be provided with food. This Act constitutes a landmark in the history of the treatment of animals. Its provisions were subsequently extended to Ireland.

We now come to the Act of 1849 (12 and 13 Vict., c. 92), which may rightly be regarded as the Charter of the Rights of Animals, but the substance of the new Act had been contained in the Statute of 1835. By Section 2 it was provided "That if any person shall after the passing of this Act cruelly beat, illtreat, overdrive, abuse or torture, &c., any animal, every such offender shall for every such offence forfeit and pay a penalty not exceeding £5." The Act did not apply to Scotland. The full importance of this measure, the short title of which is the "Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act," was not realised at the time. It is small wonder, indeed, that in the press of more important matters in those momentous times a question which appealed to a small minority of the nation only should attract but little notice. To-day it may be said with much truth that each year places the importance of the Statute—and especially of its second section—in a clearer light. It is, indeed, one of those measures which outrun the public opinion of the day, and for this cause have a very lengthy period of vitality before them. Section 29 defines the word "animal," which was to mean "any horse, mare, gelding, bull, ox, heifer,

steer, calf, mule, ass, sheep, lamb, hog, pig, sow, goat, dog, cat, or any other domestic animal."

In 1839 it was forbidden to use dogs for the purpose of draught in London, and in 1854 this prohibition was extended to the whole kingdom. The year 1869 saw an Act for the Protection of Sea Birds—the first of many subsequent enactments dealing with wild birds—which had been rendered necessary by the great decrease in numbers of these birds, caused by their being shot during the breeding-time. The Act established a close season for certain sea birds between April 1 and August 1 in each year in the United Kingdom, with the exception of the Island of St. Kilda. Other wild bird Statutes followed in 1872 and 1876. All three measures, however, were repealed by the Act of 1880.

Keeping for the moment to the chronological sequence, we come to the Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876, the much debated Vivisection Act. A Royal Commission, under the presidency of Lord Cardwell, had been appointed to inquire into the subject of experiments on living animals, which—especially with regard to experiments on the Continent—had been for some time agitating the public conscience. The result of the labours of the Commissioners is embodied in the Statute by which experiments on living animals, calculated to give pain, are controlled to-day. But the Act does not apply to invertebrate animals. The terms of the Statute need judicial interpretation in several particulars, apart altogether from the merits of vivisection, but opportunity for this has seldom if ever arisen, as by minute attention on the part of experimenters to the regulations of the Act and the requirements of the Home Secretary, they are protected for the most part from hostile proceedings.

The Wild Birds' Protection Act, 1880, which is the principal Act dealing with the subject, imposes penalties on any person shooting or taking, &c., or having in his possession any wild bird between March 1 and August 1 in every year. The Home Secretary, on the application of justices at Quarter Sessions (now the County Councils), has power to extend or vary the close time in any county. A long list of birds protected is appended in a schedule. The following year "larks" were included in this list. The combined Statutes are by no means easy to construe, more particularly with regard to the words "recently taken." In 1894 the Secretary of State was empowered, upon application by the County Council by Order, to prohibit taking or destroying eggs in certain places and for certain periods. The Home Secretary is likewise empowered to apply the principal Act—*i.e.*, of 1880—to wild birds not named therein. Provision is also made for the annual publication by a County Council of any Orders in force under the Act. This measure applies to Scotland and Ireland.

To complete the tale, in 1896 the close season was, for particular

birds, extended to the whole year; and power was given to the Court, in addition to any penalty imposed, to order any trap, net, snare, or decoy-bird to be forfeited. A further measure passed in 1902 makes any wild bird or wild bird's egg liable to forfeiture; and two other Acts followed in 1904. The first of these imposes a penalty for setting a trap on a tree, &c., for any wild bird so as to cause it injury, as also for allowing such trap to be set. The latter Statute extends the provisions of the Wild Birds Acts to the Island of St. Kilda, excepting as regards certain birds—puffin, gannet, guillemot, and so forth—required for the support of the inhabitants. But the fork-tailed petrel and St. Kilda's wren are protected. All these various Acts—1880–1904—are to be read as one, and, together with the various and numerous Orders issued under them, constitute a perfect code of law on the subject. To-day there are few counties or districts which do not possess their own particular list of protected birds.

But to return to the list of measures more particularly concerned with the prevention of cruelty to animals. In 1894 the Injured Animals Act enabled police constables to slaughter any horse, mule or ass so severely injured that it cannot, without cruelty, be led away. The Statute appears to have primarily in view the injuries of horses in street accidents, and the incidental suffering of the animals therefrom. If the owner is absent or refuses his consent to its destruction, the constable is to act on a certificate of a duly registered veterinary surgeon (if one can be found living within a reasonable distance) without the consent of the owner. As regards Scotland, the Act of 1849 did not apply to that country, but in the following year a Statute was passed "for the more effectual Prevention of Cruelty to Animals," which, although shorter, is substantially the same as the leading Act. In 1892 the case of *Johnstone* v. *Abercrombie* was decided in the Scottish Court of Justiciary, which was a test case on the question of the legality of cock-fighting, and it was held that cruelty to a cock was not an offence against the Scotch Act, because a cock did not fall within the definition of "animal" given in Section 11. This decision led to the passing of a Statute in 1895 to amend the Act of 1850. The definition of the word "animal" was extended so as to include "any game or fighting cock or other domestic fowl or bird." Thus Scotland was brought into line with other parts of the kingdom on this subject.

In *Harper* v. *Marcks*, a case in which performing lions were exhibited at the old Westminster Aquarium, it was held that lions were not "domestic animals," but a few years later was passed the "Wilds Animals in Captivity Protection Act," 1900, which defines "animal" as used in the Act to mean any bird, beast, fish or reptile which is not included in the Acts of 1849 and 1854. This measure prohibits any unnecessary suffering being caused to any captive

animal, and forbids such animal being cruelly abused, infuriated, teased or terrified, but the Act does not apply to certain Acts necessary in the preparation of an animal for food, nor to any Act permitted by the Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876 (the Vivisection Act), nor to the hunting or coursing of any animal which has not been liberated in an injured state to facilitate its capture or destruction. The meaning of the word "cruelty" is nowhere defined by Statute, and we have, therefore, to fall back on various judicial definitions. In the nature of the case it is impossible to lay down any hard and fast rule as to what constitutes cruelty, a question to a large extent one of sentiment and humane feeling, which differs in different minds. Some judges (like the late Lord Coleridge) have given the widest possible interpretation to the word, whilst others have viewed any extension of its meaning with great jealousy. Moreover, decisions in Scotland and Ireland are hard to reconcile with those in England on this point. Perhaps the definition contained in Webster's Dictionary, "an act which causes extreme suffering without good reason," can hardly be improved upon. Baron Cleasby says:

> "Whenever the purpose for which the act is done is to make the animal more serviceable for the use of man, the Statute ought not to be held to apply, and Chief Baron Kelly remarks that the Act may be cruel in the sense that it gives pain, yet the cruelty may be legalised by reference to the object with which it is inflicted."

Thus in Scotland as well as Ireland the practice of dishorning cattle, though attended with much suffering, has been held justifiable on the ground of benefit to the farming industry; but in England, where other conditions prevail, the practice has been held illegal. Cruelty in killing an animal is punishable, but omitting to kill one has been held not to constitute an offence in a case where a person had shot a neighbour's dog in the eye with a pistol and had then taken no steps to put it out of pain by killing it. But the decision would have been different in a case of wanton cruelty as distinguished from merely passive neglect. But it appears that to shoot at a dog trespassing is not of necessity "cruelly ill-treating it." It is a question of degree. Of late years the conditions under which animals are slaughtered, whether for butcher's meat or not, have been greatly ameliorated, and many municipalities have their own slaughter-houses to-day. In 1877 the Local Government Board issued certain model bye-laws applying to private slaughter-houses which supplement the general law—which is of too complicated a character to be dealt with here. Suffice it to say that by the Public Health Act, 1875, district councils are empowered to make bye-laws for the regulation of public abattoirs.

With regard to the Vivisection Act, up to the present no general

or special Orders under the Act have been issued by the Home Secretary, but forms of application for licences to perform operations and of certificates of the various kinds are on sale as Stationery Office publications. It may be of interest to note that in the latest return to the House of Commons there were only four cases of irregularities, and we are informed that the Secretary of State having received explanation from the gentlemen concerned, was satisfied that there had been no intention of evading or infringing the Act, and that the irregularities were due to inadvertence or misunderstanding. By his direction a suitable reproof was administered in each case. The total number of experiments in 1904 was 32,562, being 13,478 more than in the preceding year. It is pointed out that the great increase in the number of inoculations and similar proceedings is in consequence mainly of the progressive importance attached to biological tests generally in practical medicine for the diagnosis, treatment and prevention of disease, and to the more widely recognised need for such experiments on the part of those responsible for the care of the public health. The fact that many municipalities and other public bodies are interested in these experiments renders any extensive interference with experiments under anæsthetics very improbable. Into this much debated question it is not our purpose to enter, but it is plain that as the difference between man and the animal creation is realised to be one of degree rather than of kind, humanity to animals will tend to become one of the foremost tenets of a practical morality.

G. P. Gordon.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

SOCIOLOGY, POLITICS, AND JURISPRUDENCE.

A more appropriate title, perhaps, for *The Anglo-Saxon: A Study in Evolution*,[1] by Mr. George E. Boxall, would have been *The Glorification of the Anglo-Saxon*. After a residence of forty years in Australia and two in America, the author was astonished, on his return to this country, to find it so backward, in comparison with the younger English-speaking communities. The author's object in this book is to draw together the various sections of the Anglo-Saxon race by enabling them to realise their own characteristics, of which the chief is their love of self-government. The Anglo-Saxon, says Mr. Boxall, is a cross between the Teuton and Latinised Celt. The former belongs to the Xanthochroic race, whose habitat was round the shores of the Baltic; the latter to the Melanochroic race, which made its first appearance in Europe in Greece. No doubt the love of self-government has been stronger in the Anglo-Saxon or English-speaking communities than in the Latin. Or perhaps we should say that the physical strength of the Xanthochroic, united to the mental alertness of the Melanochroic, has produced a race better fitted to survive in the race-struggle than the more ancient and purer-bred races. In describing everything which is bad as Latin, we think Mr. Boxall has overshot the mark. He appears to entirely overlook the fact that the Latin races passed through exactly the same stages of development as the Teuton. The Latins possessed the institution of village communities as well as the Teutons or the Hindoos. If slavery was a Latin institution, so also was it Teuton. The free cities of England and the Continent were in most instances the direct descendants of the old Roman municipia. The feudal system, again, was not peculiar to Rome. It was well on its way in Saxon England before the Norman Conquest. Again, Mr. Boxall's conclusion that the ancient Briton was wiped out by the Roman rule and the Saxon invasion is quite unwarranted in view of recent investigations. Moreover, it is the opinion of modern anthropologists that the Celt is beginning to predominate in these islands. Nevertheless, incomplete and inaccurate as Mr. Boxall's

[1] *The Anglo-Saxon: A Study in Evolution.* By George E. Boxall. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1906.

account is in some respects—and in such a wide survey omissions and mistakes are inevitable—we think he is correct in his main contentions. The weakness of the Latin is his want of perseverance and humanitarianism. In his last pages Mr. Boxall recognises that he has spoken somewhat harshly of the Latin races. He frankly admits the debt we owe to them educationally. He labels the spirit of coercion as Latin, and urges that the survivals of Latin dominance are the great source of the evils which afflict society. Whether this be so or not, all Liberals will agree in extending the blessings of liberty and self-government to all sections of the community. This is a book which will repay careful study.

Studies in Socialism,[1] by M. Jean Jaurès, translated by Miss Mildred Minturn, forms the third volume of the Socialist Library, edited by Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald, M.P. M. Jaurès is the chief exponent in France of the method of reform as opposed to the method of revolution. In his eyes the social and political problems are closely united. He sees but two great parties, the party of the Revolution and the party of the Counter-Revolution. The latter is represented in the French Chamber by the Opposition whose aim is to overthrow the whole Republican *régime*, re-establish Monarchy, and undo the work of the Revolution. "It is not," writes Jaurès, "by an unexpected counterstroke of political agitation that the proletarian will gain supreme power, but by the methodical and legal organisation of its own forces under the law of democracy and universal suffrage." It is upon those lines, in Mr. Macdonald's opinion, that the Labour Party in Great Britain should work. A Parliamentary Socialist Party, he says, in his Introduction, may adopt one of three methods. It may content itself with permeating other Parties; it may remain isolated and revolutionary, or may remain independent, combining the permeation method with revolutionary enthusiasm, and by its separate organisation securing a share in administration and legislation. M. Jaurès is probably correct in asserting that the bourgeoisie has proved its incapacity to rule, but the proletariat has still to give evidence of its ability to do better. The Poplar inquiry, for instance, would seem to show members drawn from the latter class are no more capable of ruling than those of the middle class they seek to replace. It must not be forgotten that the temptations of office appeal more strongly to the Labour member than to the wealthy bourgeoisie. No one pretends that the rule of the upper classes which now so largely prevails is perfect or disinterested, but it has taken long centuries of training to make it what it is. The proletariat will not reach the same standard by revolutionary

1 *Studies in Socialism.* By Jean Jaurès. Translated, with an Introduction, by Mildred Minturn. The Socialist Library. Vol. III. Edited by J. Ramsay Macdonald, M.P. London: Independent Labour Party. 1906.

methods. They will only do so by continuing the evolutionary processes which have been long ages in the making. They may hasten the pace, but they cannot cut out the intermediate stages, and they can only hasten the pace by availing themselves of the political and social forces which are already in existence. The capitalist order of industry has broken down, but if capital and land are to change hands by violent methods it will not be the proletariat who will ultimately get the benefit. It is by the slow but surer methods of municipalisation of the instruments of production and distribution, of systems of profit-sharing, of co-operation, of organisation of labour, that the workers will come by their own. We are glad to recognise in Mr. Macdonald, the exponent of the policy of the Independent Labour Party, a firm grasp of those qualities which make for practical Statesmanship.

Sunday Observance: Its Origin and Meaning,[1] by Dr. W. W. Hardwicke, is a closely-reasoned argument against the Puritanical observance of the first day of the week as a day of idleness in this country. Dr. Harwicke clearly proves that the modern Sunday in all its hideousness and senseless waste of time has no Divine authority, and only dates from post-Reformation times. A day of rest is undoubtedly necessary, both socially and economically, but to a large mass of the people Sunday means merely a day of enforced idleness. We heartily welcome this timely protest against an effete institution.

A Nation's Youth, Physical Deterioration: Its Causes and Some Remedies,[2] by the Countess of Warwick, is a powerful plea, cogently reasoned and ably illustrated, for the amelioration of the condition to a larger proportion of the children in our elementary schools. "Parental responsibility" is dismissed by Lady Warwick as a fetish of which thousands of innocent children are annually sacrificed. Granting we are weakening the sense of parental responsibility, is not this loss more than compensated by the rearing of a superior race of future parents? All reformers have recognised that to raise adults is almost a hopeless task, but as Lady Warwick insists, "give the children a chance" and we shall "make a new race of them." Sir John Gorst gives an interesting introduction in which he sketches the history of recent political parties in relation to social problems. His remarks on the Tory party are very striking from one who was so long associated with its fortunes. Politics make strange bedfellows. That he should have supported for so many years a party whose "indifference to the welfare of the poor culminated in the proposal to tax the food of the people in order to

[1] *Sunday Observance: Its Origin and Meaning.* By W. W. Hardwicke, M.D. London: Watts & Co. 1906.

[2] *A Nation's Youth.* Physical Deterioration: Its Causes and Some Remedies. By the Countess of Warwick. With an Introduction by Sir John E. Gorst. London, Paris, New York, and Melbourne: Cassell & Co., Ltd. 1906.

promote the glory of the Empire and furnish additional opportunities of accumulating wealth to capitalists and financiers" is certainly remarkable.

Peace and War,[1] by M. Ch. Richet, translated from the French by Miss Marian Edwards, appears opportunely in this country when we are still feeling the effects of the South African War, and have begun to ask ourselves was it worth the cost? To the argument that because there has always been war there always will be war, M. Richet returns a direct negative. There always have been wars, therefore a time will come when war will cease; for the history of evolution proves that change and not immobility has been the law of every society which has existed. And this, says M. Richet, is not so far off as some people imagine. The pacific movement has made greater progress during the last ten years than during the ten previous centuries. When it has penetrated into the consciences of the masses and when the masses once obtain power, then the present monstrous preparations for war will cease, and the means now so wantonly wasted will be devoted to the promotion of progress.

Mr. Joseph McCabe has done good service in *The Truth About Secular Education: Its History and Results*.[2] We have never felt any doubt that the great mass of the people are completely indifferent to dogmatic religious teaching in our elementary schools. Nay, we go further and say they are decidedly hostile to such teaching and in favour of a purely secular education. As Mr. McCabe rightly points out, the religious bodies, highly organised as they are, are able to make more noise than their real strength justifies, whilst the masses are unorganised and consequently inarticulate. The only possible logical solution, the practicable means of obtaining a sound national system of education, lies in entirely excluding religious instruction from our schools. Mr. McCabe reminds us that it was only three years ago Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman said: "If we had our way, there would be no religious difference at all. We should confine ourselves—I believe nine-tenths of Liberals would confine themselves—to secular education, and to such moral precepts as would be common to all, and would not be obnoxious to people who do not come within the range of Christianity." If such was the position then the situation is even more pronounced now. All thinking men are sick to death with these sectarian squabbles amidst the din of which all true educationists have no chance of gaining a hearing. If the Liberal Party is to remain the party of the future, it must free its mind of cant and the timidity of cant.

[1] *Peace and War.* By Ch. Richet. Translated from the French by Marian Edwards. London: J. M. Dent & Co. 1906.

[2] *The Truth About Secular Education: Its History and Results.* By Joseph McCabe. London: Watts & Co. 1906.

One does not often find, in a political work dealing with constitutional right as it was understood and applied in the last decade of the eighteenth century, ideas and principles which are still a *desideratum* in the first decade of the twentieth century; but this is the case of an Italian monograph on the Constitution[1] of 1796. Napoleon having conquered, as General of the French Republic, the northern States of Italy, framed, for the benefit of the short-lived Cisalpine Republic, a Constitution after the 1791 French Constitution. He somewhat enlarged the franchise, protecting, however, the electoral vote with many dispositions of law, some of which would not be out of place even to-day. He created two kinds of electors. The active citizens would vote for an elector, and the electors would vote for a deputy. This graduatory system of election seemed to have worked very well in Lombardy. Outlanders were almost unknown in the Cisalpine Republic, as any alien, by simply residing in the State and making a declaration of allegiance, became *ipso facto* an active citizen. The form of declaration was rather strong, inasmuch as it implied a denunciation of any monarchial power. The author compares here and there the electoral machinery of the Cisalpine Republic with the electoral machinery then existing in England, to show that the former was much more liberal. The English electoral law has since been reformed many a time, yet some of the principles adopted by Napoleon—amongst others that of one man one vote—are still awaiting the sanction of the British Parliament. The book is modestly written, with numerous quotations from the writings and papers of the times, enriched with keen observations and remarks by the author, who has evidently studied the subject very deeply.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

The Thirty Years War has supplied for the last two hundred years material or argument for many literary works. The last book of a long series is in Italian, and deals with the war fought for three years in the valley of the Po and which culminated in the siege of Turin, May—September, 1706. The ducal House of Savoy was allied with England, and Eugene of Savoy fought sometimes on the same battlefield as Marlborough, sometimes in another part of Europe. The victory of Marlborough at Ramillies almost synchronised with that of Savoy against the French at Turin, to which latter victory some soldiers sent to Italy

[1] *Il Diritto Elettorale Politico secondo la Costitusione Cisalpina.* By Giuseppe Gallavresi. Published by L. J. Cogliati, Milan.

by Marlborough contributed. The importance of the defeat of the French was great for the Allies and greater still for the House of Savoy, whose kingly power dates exactly from that victory, which led to the utter defeat of the French army in Italy. In order to commemorate the second centenary of this campaign the Italian authorities have decided to issue an edition of special documents from the State archives. Signor Pietro Fea, forestalling the official publication, has written an interesting description, historical and military, of the same campaign in a volume of nearly 400 pages, with maps and illustrations.[1] The part Prince Eugene took in that campaign and Marlborough's contribution to it is ably narrated in all its main aspects. As a descriptive work it deserves all the recommendation we can bestow on it. A full chapter of this book is justly devoted to Pietro Micca, the hero of the siege of Turin. It is said that every soldier that goes to war carries his life in his hands; undoubtedly it is expected that every soldier should be ready to sacrifice his own life if needed; but we think that, even amongst the heroes, very few have laid down their life so freely and so spontaneously as Micca did. A body of Frenchmen, after 110 days of siege, had succeeded in forcing their way into the outer gate of the citadel, and were threatening the internal doorway. Micca was behind the iron door, and as there were not sufficient soldiers on the spot to defend it, decided there and then to put fire to the mine. He asked his three companions to depart at once. As soon as he saw them out of harm's way, with the lighted torch in his hand he approached the gunpowder. A second after he was blown to pieces, but the same fate was met by the assailing party. The author gives two authoritative versions of this episode. Within a week from this event the French were routed out of Turin—and in a very short time afterwards out of Italy also. Signor Fea dwells upon the scanty recognition the heroical action of Micca received at that time. Two hundreds of years ago it was not, perhaps, becoming for a general to take much notice of the deeds of an obscure artillery-man. What posterity could do to atone the neglect of his contemporaries was nobly done, as is clearly shown in this book.

[1] *Tre Anni di Guerra e l'Assedio di Torino*, by Pietro Fea, published by Enrico Voghera, Rome.

BELLES LETTRES.

Mr. Richard Whiteing has scored another success in his new work, *Ring in the New.*[1] Mr. Whiteing will always be remembered as the author of *No. 5, John Street*, and the qualities he then displayed will be found undiminished in the present venture. The heroine is a young girl, who, left penniless by her parents, becomes the companion of a wealthy aunt of the usual conventional city type. Prudence Morgan—Prue for short—soon found the restraints of such a life unbearable, and with little more than £20 in her pocket cast off the conventionalities of polite society and set up a humble establishment of two rooms in a street off the Gray's Inn Road. Her struggle to find work and make both ends meet, and that of other women similarly placed, form the thread of the story. The motive is to contrast the overflowing wealth of the few with the abject poverty of the masses. Mr. Whiteing shows clearly enough that the unequal distribution of wealth is a cancer which is eating out the manhood of the nation. "Wealth," says George Leonard, Prue's lover, "is a mere craving, like gin and tobacco; we want a wealth-cure. We're rotting of prosperity ill-diffused." George is a socialist, and preaches the doctrine of collectivist ownership in a convincing manner. All the characters are strongly drawn, and the pictures from the seamy side are life-like in fact and in the telling. The book, we understand, was written before the General Election, so that the triumph of the Labour Party at the polls was prophecy justified by the event. This is a novel to keep and to re-read.

Miss (?) Eilis Dean is already favourably known to readers of the *Westminster Review* as the author of *A Raw Probationer*, which dealt with the trials of a young girl who had adopted nursing as a profession. *The New Matron*,[2] by the same clever writer, is in every respect worthy of its predecessor. Tarraville Hospital, Queensland, at the time when Bessie Deniston, who, in spite of red-gold hair and grey-blue eyes, had, happily for herself, a strong will of her own, must have been a dreadful place. The patients were half-starved, and modern doctrines of sanitation set at nought. In addition to this the new doctor was an unmitigated cad, of dubious credentials, who intrigued against the new matron from the outset in order to bring about the re-appointment of the old, who had been his obedient tool. How his wiles were baffled must be left to the individual reader to discover for him or herself. It is a story of unflagging interest.

Alfred de Musset made the moon the subject of a humorous

[1] *Ring in the New.* By Richard Whiteing. London: Hutchinson & Son, 1906.
[2] *The New Matron.* By Ellis Dean. London: Digby, Long & Co.

ballade, and most of us have heard in childhood the old story of "the man in the moon." Mr. Charles Hannen has, however, in *Thuka of the Moon*,[1] peopled that planet with a race of mortals formed in the likeness of the gods, but sunk in a lethargic sleep. "They had power of speech, just as the gods had speech. To each other they might have spoken, yet they spoke not." But in each moon-man's clouded brain there was a dim perception of a heaven that lay beyond their mountains. Thuka, however, was not like those silent statues his fellows, but a full-formed, reasoning being, who scaled heaven after a dire conflict with a hideous crab-like monster called the craton. People who like fantastic stories will find much to interest them in *Thuka of the Moon*; but its plot is too complicated and its symbolism too baffling for the average reader of fiction. Its style, however, which in descriptive passages rises at times to eloquence, is uniformly attractive.

"Set a thief to catch a thief" was the adage on which Messrs. Bunting and Beveridge acted with conspicuous success in *The Maid with the Goggles*,[2] though, had they been aware of the emotional nature of their tool, who was more sinned against than sinning it is highly improbable that so astute a firm of detectives would have employed her to bring to justice a titled lady "with a past." The story is highly sensational, and does not fall below the level of detective stories in general, but Miss E. T. Meade has done far better work than this.

POETRY.

The Religious Songs of Connacht[3] consist of poems, prayers, "paidirs," petitions, "orthas," charms, stories, blessings, curses, &c., taken down, for the most part, by Mr. Douglas Hyde, from the mouths of the shanachies and old people during a period of about twenty years. The original text and its translation appear on alternate pages. In the case of the poems, which are rendered very gracefully, a literal prose version is occasionally given. Their number and variety make quotation from them difficult; but, to our thinking, the following stanza from the king-poet, Patrick O'Byrne, is unique in beauty:

> The King of heaven, in His goodness, even
> Waits for the sinner who is still depraved,
> Welcome shall meet him and the angels greet him,
> A lowly penitent among the saved.

[1] *Thuka of the Moon.* By Charles Hannen. London: Digby, Long & Co.
[2] *The Maid with the Goggles.* By E. T. Meade. London: Digby, Long & Co.
[3] *The Religious Songs of Connacht.* By Douglas Hyde. 2 vols. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

An abiding sense of sin, dark pictures of the doom reserved for worldlings, a tender devotion to the Theotokos, and a rigid orthodoxy characterise the poems. If the priest who stands between the people and their oppressors is deservedly venerated, the priest who apostatises for worldly reward, or who courts the rich and neglects the poor, is the object of playful or malignant satire. Until recently almost every act had a special prayer assigned to it, and some of these are very quaint—*e.g.*, that on covering up a coal or two deeply under the embers overnight, so that a fire might be readily rekindled in the morning. It runs thus:

As I save this fire to-night,
Even so may Christ save me.
On the top of the house let Mary,
Let Bride in its middle be.

Prayers are provided for use on making bread, milking a cow, making a bed, and after tobacco. *The Mad Priest, and how the First Cat was Created* are among the more noticeable stories. There are charms for whooping-cough, trembling, toothache, the evil eye, &c., some of which are Pagan, others Christian, and a few unintelligible. Many analogues to these may be found in the Anglo-Saxon Leechdoms. We are grateful to Mr. Douglas Hyde for having rescued this traditional lore from the oblivion with which it was threatened by the "National" schools. A generation ago Celtic studies were seriously pursued by few except a small band of Germans and Frenchmen, whose articles appeared in *La Revue Celtique*. At the present time they are engaging the attention of thousands on both sides of the Atlantic.

Cassandra and other Poems,[1] by Mr. Bernard Drew, are thoughtful, scholarly, and permeated by genuine religious feeling. Mr. Drew's genius finds fittest expression in the ode. "Ode to Nature in Autumn" exhibits the author's style at its best:

"The woods are dying; O Mother, thy children fall,
Slowly, solemnly leaf by scarlet leaf
Decked with the hues of the sun in the days that were all too brief,
The voice of music is hushed in thy crumbling hall!
The gloom of eve is around;
The shadows creep on,
Weaving fantastic shapes
Far o'er the ground,
Mystic and garlanded
As some dread goddess-head
With shafts of dying light;
Crimson and thousand-tinted hues of gold,
Mingled with that half-glimmer that escapes
As some stray antiphon,
Far from the darkling fold,
Bourned by the sombre portals of the night!"

[1] *Cassandra and Other Poems.* By Bernard Drew. London: David Nutt.

Very stately, too, is his unrhymed "Hymn to the Deity," from which the space at our disposal does not permit us to quote; but we think that the specimen we have given of Mr. Drew's muse is sufficient to enable the public to form a fair opinion of his work.

Restlessness and the longing of one "close in touch with the instinctive source of tears" are the dominant note in the *Lyrics*[1] of Mr. Gerald Gould. Life is to him a pilgrimage, with no certain sanctuary for its goal; but the "wander-thirst" will not let him be:

"It works in me like madness, dear, to bid me say good-bye;
For the seas call and the stars call, and, oh! the call of the sky!

. . . . .

I know not where the white road runs, nor what the blue hills are,
But a man can have the sun for friend, and for his guide a star.
And there's no end of voyaging when once the voice is heard,
For the rivers call and the roads call, and, oh! the call of a bird!"

Again, in "The Sea-Captain," he tells us that, in spite of "the tall ships she has slain,"

"As a man loves a woman, so I love the sea,
And even as my desire of her is her desire of me."

The "desire of the eternal hills" obsesses him:

"The hills are grey, they are strange; they breed desire
Of a tune that the feet may march to and not tire!
For always up in the distance the thin roads wind,
And passing out of sight, they pass not out of mind."

"Twilight," when

"The fields grow dim; the sombre hills
Stand crucified against the skies;
Blue in the distance rise
The ancient hills."

may be likened to one of Whistler's colour-harmonies. The harsh simile of the opening lines serves to accentuate the deepening atmosphere of repose in the stanzas that follow. "Heart's Adventure" has the true lyric thrill:

"My heart comes heavy down the slope,
Now the stars shine;
Empty of dreams, empty of hope,
Love o' mine."

Nevertheless, though love has brought the poet more of sorrow than of joy, he is convinced, in "Respice,"

"That whatever end there be of the blindness and the strife,
It is well to have loved."

[1] *Lyrics.* By Gerald Gould. London: David Nutt.

We are loth to take leave of this slender volume of exquisite haunting verse.

My Lady of Dreams[1] is the title given by Mr. Lloyd Mifflin to his latest collection of verses in praise of his lady love. At the outset the reader is importuned:

> "Warily tread o'er the delicate bridge of dreams
> Builded in silence from tremulous cobweb and mist,"

and he proceeds to tell us:

> "For she is a reed a-quiver
> And I am the wind, her desire."

Very beautiful is "A Last Word to the Lady of his Love":

> "When this passionate heart is placed at last upon Love's own pyre,
> And the wraith of it, incense-like, ascends to the twilight sky,
> Take the words I whispered once on a time, O soul of my soul's desire,
> And croon them low on the violet banks where we were wont to lie."

Nevertheless, his more passionate strains find best expression in languorous unrhymed verse, reminiscent, in its glowing Oriental imagery, of the "Song of Songs which is of Solomon." Mr. Lloyd Mifflin at his best is admirable; but we hold it our duty to warn him against a tendency to mistake mere prettiness for beauty—a fault into which he is occasionally led by his too prolific muse.

[1] *My Lady of Dreams.* By Lloyd Mifflin. London: Henry Frowde.

THE

WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

VOL. CLXVI. No. 3.—SEPTEMBER 1906.

THE MONTH.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

"Something Attempted, Something Done."

THE Summer Session is over. The House of Commons rose on August 4 for a well-earned holiday, and the present is therefore a good opportunity for taking stock of the work accomplished in the first six months of the new Parliament. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman pointed out in December last that the then recently-formed Liberal-Labour Government could achieve nothing worth while unless the country provided the necessary driving-power. Ample driving-power was furnished by the electorate in January of this year, and that good use has been made of that power is shown by the record of the Session just closed. It is, indeed, a record of work done that for quantity and quality, especially for quality, compares favourably not merely with the work of any single Session of the late Tory Government, but with the total output of the whole ten years of Tory rule. In all seventy-one Government measures have been presented to the House of Commons, and of these no less than thirty-seven, including four of the measures promised in the King's Speech, have received the Royal assent. The four King's Speech measures thus placed on the Statute-book are the Justices of the Peace Act, abolishing the property qualification previously required of county magistrates; the Labourers (Ireland) Act, which amends the law relating to the provision of labourers' dwellings in Ireland, and provides for more simple and efficient administration and cheaper loans; the Colonial Marriages Act,[1] providing that a marriage with a deceased wife's sister, contracted in a British colony, and legal in that colony, shall be legal in the United Kingdom; and the Prevention of Corruption Act,[1] which makes it punishable to

[1] These two measures were first introduced in the House of Lords.

give to or accept from an agent, in relation to his principal's affairs, a bribe, secret commission, or other consideration. Of the other Bills foreshadowed in the King's Speech, the Education Bill, the *pièce de resistance* of the Session, has passed the Commons, and been read a second time in the Lords, though not without divers threats as to what their lordships may do "to safeguard and protect the interests of their friends" if the Government does not forthwith accept in a humble and chastened spirit the Bishops' amendments to the Bill. The Merchant Shipping Bill, the Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment Bill, and the Trades Disputes Bill have passed through their second reading and committee stages, the Government, thanks once more to the pedantry of the lawyers, narrowly escaping defeat on the last-named; while the Plural Voting Bill has passed its second reading, and the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill awaits that stage. The Equalisation of Rates (London) Bill stands over till next session, when the whole question of local rating is to be dealt with, and the Unemployed Workmen's Act Amendment Bill has also been postponed, but in the meantime £200,000 has been provided for the needs of the coming winter.

Useful but not Root Reforms.

Of the thirty-three Government Bills, other than King's Speech measures, which have received the Royal assent, many, though not in the nature of root reforms, are of a most useful character. The Army Annual Bill, in addition to the usual clauses, abolishes flogging in military prisons, and in this connection it will be remembered that the Government has also by administrative order suspended, practically abolished, flogging in the Navy. The Police (Superannuation) Bill amends the law as to retirement from the police force to the advantage of the force and of the individual policeman, and at the same time relieves the burden on the rates; the Alkali, &c., Works Bill consolidates and amends the Acts of 1881 and 1892; the Metropolitan Police (Commission) Bill set up a much-needed Commission to inquire into the relations between the police and the public within the metropolitan area; the Statute Law Revision (Scotland) Bill repeals certain obsolete enactments, and reduces the law from ten volumes to one; while the Musical Copyright Bill, introduced by Mr. T. P. O'Connor, but afterwards taken up by the Government, is aimed against the "music piracy" which has been so rife of recent years. The Finance Bill, not by any means a heroic measure, makes provision for the revenue of the current year, reduces the duty on tea by a penny per pound, abolishes the Coal Tax, and eliminates the element of Protection from the duty on stripped tobacco. And (in contrast to the late Government, which devoted six hours in five years to the interest of agriculture, and

that only to renew the Agricultural Rating Act in the interest of the drones in the hive) the present Government has already passed the Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Bill and the Dogs Bill, to safeguard the working farmer, and by the Crown Lands Bill, making the President of the Board of Agriculture an additional Commissioner of Woods and Forests, &c., has enabled Lord Carrington to apply his system of small holdings to the Crown lands. Already one derelict farm of some 900 acres has been let in small holdings, and as occasion offers, the area so let will be extended. The Seed Potatoes Supply (Ireland) Bill is another palliative intended to ease the position of the occupiers of land in that distressful isle, while the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill aims at ameliorating the condition of the Scottish crofters, giving security for improvements, fixity of tenure, "fair rents," and extended powers for increasing the size of the holdings. There is little doubt, too, that the Government will give facilities for the passing into law of Mr. Agar Robarte's Land Tenure (England and Wales) Bill, which has already passed the Standing Committee. Unfortunately, it must be admitted that all these measures on behalf of agriculture are merely palliatives. The root cause of agricultural depression, as of industrial depression generally, is land monopoly; and until that root cause is removed other measures, however well intended and however good in themselves, can do little or nothing to benefit the workers in the agricultural hive. But we trust that next year, by the rating and taxation of land values, the Government will do something both to break down land monopoly and to break up the depression which has so long overshadowed the great farming industry.

Will the Lords Block the Way?

The close of the Summer Session was noteworthy for the fact that there was no "slaughter of the innocents," such as we had grown accustomed to under the Balfour *régime*. Whatever slaughtering of the innocents is done this year will be done by the House of Lords. Some twenty-nine Government measure still remain to be dealt with by the House of Commons during the Autumn Session. Of these the Criminal Appeal Bill, introduced in the Lords and now awaiting its second reading in the Commons, and the Street Betting Bill which was also introduced in the Lords and has passed its second reading and committee stages in the Commons, are practically sure to pass; while the more important of the other Government measures not already mentioned are Mr. Lloyd George's Census of Production Bill, committed on August 2, and Mr. Burns's Public Health (Regulations as to Food) Bill, which awaits its second reading. In addition to the Education Bill the measures which are most liable to attack by the House of Lords are

perhaps the Trades Disputes Bill, the Plural Voting Bill, and the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill. It is true that the recent decision ot the Court of Appeal that local authorities are entitled to refuse to contribute from public funds towards the cost of denominational teaching in Church schools has to some extent taken the heart out of the fight against the Education Bill, but the Bishops have more of the wisdom of the serpent than of the harmlessness of the dove, and a close watch must therefore be kept upon their lordships. The Bishops, however, would do well to remember that the only alternative to the present Bill is "the secular solution"; that the people are weary of the wrangling and jangling of the sects in regard to education; and that the Romeward tendencies of the so-called National Church, as illustrated by the report of the Ritual Commission, have not tended to endear the Church to the nation, but, like the Anti-Education Acts of 1902 and 1903, have quickened the movement for Disestablishment. The Peers may hesitate to antagonise labour by emasculating or rejecting the Trades Disputes Bill, but it should be remembered that they did not scruple to obstruct the Aliens Act Amendment Bill, designed to prevent the importation of foreign labourers in the *role* of "strike-breakers." As for the Plural Voting Bill and the Small Landholders Bill, are they not direct attacks upon the Ark of the Covenant, the sacred property rights of the big landholders, which it is the special function of the House of Landlords to protect? The Lords, it is certain, will be greatly tempted to block the way for all these measures, but whether they will venture to do so remains to be seen.

Away with the Lords!

In order that the long outstanding account of the people against the Peers might be settled once for all, one could almost wish that their lordships would run amok against the Education Bill, the Trades Disputes Bill, and other important Government measures. In the meantime it were well that the Liberal Party should remember that while measures such as the above are at the mercy of the House of Lords, there is a very important and far-reaching class of reforms—financial reforms to wit—with which the Lords have no right to interfere. And it were well also that the Liberal Party should determine that if the Lords mutilate or reject their other measures, they will then (instead of appealing to the country as their enemies desire) proceed forthwith to carry through in the teeth of the Lords such radical financial measures as will not only establish beyond possibility of doubt their *bonâ fides* as earnest social reformers, but will also bring their lordships to their knees. That the House of Lords has no right to interfere in regard to financial matters was shown during the Liberal Administration of 1892 to 1895 by the trium-

phant passage through the Upper House of Sir William Harcourt's Death Duties Budget, and by Mr. Speaker Peel's unceremonious rejection of their lordships' amendments to the rating clauses of the Parish Councils Bill as breaches of the privileges of the Representative Chamber. It was further illustrated by the discreditable juggle resorted to during the lifetime of the late Tory Government, in order to secure the passage through the Commons of the Bishops' "Wear and Tear" amendment to the Education Bill of 1902. And it was again illustrated this Session when Mr. Speaker Lowther, who, unlike his immediate predecessor, is a man with a backbone, ruled out as a breach of privilege the amendment to the Irish Labourers' Bill by which the Lords sought to secure to the landlords an additional 10 per cent. in case of compulsory purchase. By overwhelming majorities the House of Commons has declared in favour of Payment of Members, Old Age Pensions and Local Option. A Licensing Bill has been promised for next year to give effect to the last-named, though whether such a Bill shall become law will depend upon "the Peerage and the beerage." But in the Budget effect can be given, and should be given, to Old Age Pensions and to Payment of Members in spite of the House of Lords. Want of funds cannot be pleaded in excuse, for, as we have repeatedly demonstrated, by levying the old 4*s*. Land Tax on present values, instead of on the values of more than 200 years ago, ample funds can be raised not only to carry out these reforms, but also to abolish all taxes on food and to take a penny or twopence off the Income Tax. A truly radical and democratic Government could and would carry a Budget on these lines, and would further use the engine of taxation to force the Lords to forego their unjust and anomalous powers as hereditary legislators. The House of Lords is useless and dangerous and ought to be abolished. Away with it! The right of veto should be vested, not in the Peers, but in the people by means of the referendum. In view of the coming struggle with the Non-Representative Chamber, it is well that the Government has already greatly strengthened the control of the Representative House over finance. In regard to this point the following figures afford an instructive contrast. The amounts of Supply voted and unvoted in each of the last three years before the nineteenth allotted day (when the remaining votes are automatically passed without discussion) have been:

	Voted.	Unvoted.
	£	£
1904	50,517,200	43,498,848
1905	47,576,500	50,727,870
1906	95,627,932	15,576,796

Lessons of the Bye-Elections.

The Government have done well in administration as well as in legislation. As we have seen, flogging in the Navy has been suspended; and we may mention that, among other matters, the postal employees' Trades Unions have been officially recognised by Mr. Sidney Buxton, and a Select Committee is dealing with the questions of hours and wages; the number of women factory inspectors has been increased; and a Bill for the amendment of the Truck Acts is in course of preparation for next Session; while the fact that the London County Council has now obtained powers for over-bridge and Embankment trams, and has been recognised as the authority for the supply of electricity in bulk shows how very differently such matters are regarded by Liberal and by Tory Governments. In fact the Government has done so well, and is shaping so well for the future, that it is difficult to understand why the Labour Party should have thought it worth while to challenge the Liberal position in Cockermouth and thereby let in a Tory. The result of this bye-election does not show, as Sir John Randles, the successful Tory candidate, claimed, that the people are already getting tired of the Liberal Government, for, whereas the late Sir Wilfrid Lawson's majority against Sir John in January last was 563 only, the combined Liberal and Labour vote at the bye-election shows a Progressive majority against him of 746—an increase of 183. The Bodmin bye-election where, in spite of the fact that a very strong local candidate was followed by a complete stranger, the Liberal majority remained practically unchanged—(Bye-election majority, 1093; General Election majority, 1172)—not only demonstrates that the Government is as popular as ever, but also incidentally shows the opinion of the electors in regard to Judge Grantham's decision that a "tea-fight" at Bodmin savours of corruption, while an "orgie" at Yarmouth does not. But for the split in the Progressive ranks the Liberal Party would have won again at Cockermouth, just as, but for a split in the party itself, they should have won Basingstoke in March last. The true lesson of these bye-elections, however, is not that such splits should be avoided, though in the meantime that is desirable, but that by the Second Ballot, or better still by means of the Preferential Ballot, on the lines of the Bill introduced by Mr. John M. Robertson, the return of a minority-representative should be rendered impossible. The result of the East Denbighshire bye-election, to hand as we write, fully confirms the Bodmin verdict as to the continued popularity of the Government, Mr. E. G. Hemmerde having secured the magnificent majority of 2791, or 464 more than the Liberal majority at the bye-election of 1897, the last contest prior to that just finished.

The Transvaal Constitution.

We cannot pretend to be satisfied with the new Transvaal Constitution as unfolded by Mr. Winston Churchill on August 1, though, faulty as it is, it is a great improvement upon the constitution drafted by Mr. Lyttelton. Manhood suffrage with a six months' qualification, and no votes for the officers and soldiers of the British garrison, is much fairer than Mr. Lyttelton's proposed franchise qualification of £100 annual value and the suggestion that the British garrison should have votes. But the only really fair basis for the franchise is adult suffrage, and, as we have urged before, the peculiar dangers to which women are exposed by reason of the roaming bands of Chinese deserters, make their claim to the franchise in the Transvaal particularly strong. But upon this point Mr. Churchill said merely, with a side glance no doubt at Mr. Asquith, "The question of female suffrage has been brought under the notice of various members of the Government—(laughter)—on various occasions and in various ways. We have very carefully considered that matter, and we have come to the conclusion that it would not be right for us to subject a new Colony, unable to speak for itself, to the hazards of an experiment which we have not had the gallantry to undergo ourselves. (Laughter and cheers.) That must, therefore, be left for the new Legislature to determine." We can only trust that the new Legislature will possess a higher sense of justice than the Imperial Legislature, if not so keen a sense of the humours of injustice.

A Little Gerrymandering.

But, not content with ruling them out of the franchise, women are not allowed to carry any weight even in regard to the distribution of seats. A distribution of seats in proportion to population would have done something to offset the injustice of refusing the women the vote. But it has been decided to distribute the seats upon the basis of voters rather than upon that of population. And upon this point Mr. Churchill's reasoning would seem to be very faulty indeed. Speaking of the Mother Country, he says: "There is no part of this country which is more married or more prolific than another, and exactly the same distribution of members would result, whether the voter's basis or the population basis governed the Redistribution Bill. But in South Africa the disparity of conditions between the new population and the old makes a very great difference between the urban and the rural populations, and it is undoubtedly true that if it be desired to preserve the principle of one vote one value, the voters' basis, and not the population basis, is indispensable in the Transvaal." How does this square with Mr. Churchill's previous declaration that "our guiding principle has been to make no

difference in the grant of responsible government between Boer and Briton in South Africa"? "The disparity of conditions between the new population and the old" is due to the fact that the old population is the more permanent element in the country, and therefore the "more married" element. Reverse the position. Let the British be the more permanent and the "more married" section of the community, and where then would be Mr. Churchill's regard for the principle of one vote one value as applied to the Transvaal? It seems only too clear that the aim has been, not to treat British and Boers alike, but to secure a British majority, and that, with that object in view, the voters' basis has been chosen for the distribution of seats instead of the fairer population basis. A little gerrymandering has been done, but me must, we suppose, console ourselves with the reflection that the Tories would have done much worse.

What Will the Upshot Be?

Proceeding upon the voters' basis, the Government have decided to allot 34 seats, including Krugersdorp rural, to the Rand, 6 to Pretoria, and 29 to the rest of the country. This undoubtedly gives too many seats to the Rand, but Krugersdorp rural is practically a Boer constituency, and as it is probable that others of the Rand seats will be held by the British Responsible Party, it seems unlikely that a Pro-Randlord or "Pro-Pigtail" Ministry will be formed. Indeed it may happen that Mr. Churchill's "hope that the Government that will be called into power after the election will be a coalition Government under some moderate leader acceptable to both parties—a Government that will embrace members of both races" may be realised, and "such a solution" might well prove to be, in his words, "a godsend to South Africa." The danger is, however, that things have been cut too fine, and that the majority either way may be very small. Nor do we think that the provision that the Speaker shall vacate his seat when elected, so that his party shall not practically lose a member, will do much to obviate this danger. And, as Mr. Churchill himself said, "it would be a great disaster if we had in the Transvaal a succession of weak Ministries." We note that members of the new Legislature are, as is usual in our Colonies, to be paid, a very necessary provision, as otherwise the Randlords might well capture the Legislature and pay themselves by running the Transvaal in their own interests—a method of conducting public affairs not altogether unknown in this country, though we trust that the present Government will ere long render it impossible for the future by establishing adult suffrage and introducing payment of members. In regard to the latter they have in the Transvaal Constitution set themselves an example which they cannot well refuse to follow.

Second Chambers Condemned.

We cannot say that we approve of the setting up of a Second Chamber in the Transvaal. Not only are we "not particularly enamoured of Second Chambers," to use Mr. Churchill's phrase, but we are absolutely opposed to them. And though, as the Under-Secretary for the Colonies pointed out, "there is no Colony in the British Empire which has not got a Second Chamber," and the Government is therefore following precedent in this matter, the precedent is a bad one, and might well have been disregarded. It is all to the good, however, that the Government "are unable to countenance the creation in a permanent form of a nominated Second Chamber"; and it is to be hoped that when the time comes, upon the dissolution five years hence of the first Parliament, the project of substituting an elective Second Chamber for the nominated Chamber will be abandoned; for a Second Chamber, however constituted, is always a bulwark of monopoly and privilege, and, therefore, a danger to the State. In the meantime, the nominated Chamber is established "for this Parliament only, and as a purely provisional arrangement," and its fifteen members will be nominated by the Crown—that is to say, by the Home Government. The intention of the Government in setting up the Second Chamber is no doubt a good one, their object being "to secure, if they can, some special protection for native interests"; but it is at least doubtful whether such protection can best be secured in this way. The treatment of the natives in New Zealand, where they have four special representatives in the House of Representatives, and, in addition, have a King of their own and a Parliament of their own to govern their own reserves, would seem to afford a good precedent for dealing with the natives in the Transvaal. But the matter is now one to be dealt with by the new Legislature. Far more certain than the protection secured by the establishment of the Second Chamber is that which is afforded by the determination of his Majesty's Government that "any legislation which imposes disabilities on natives which are not imposed upon Europeans will be reserved to the Secretary of State, and that the Governor will not give his assent before receiving the Secretary of State's decision"; that "legislation which will affect the alienation of native lands will also be reserved"; and that "some provision" will be made "for native interests, such as education, by reserving a certain sum for administration by the High Commissioner or some other official."

Chinese Slavery to Cease.

Even more important than the statement upon this point was the declaration, received with loud cheers, that "on November 30, 1906, the arrangements for recruiting Chinese labour will cease and determine"; that "a clause in the Constitution will provide, in accordance with the pledge given by the Chancellor of the Ex-

chequer, for the abrogation of the existing Chinese labour Ordinance after a reasonable interval"—such an interval as will "give time to the new Assembly to take stock of its position, and to consider the labour question as a whole"; and that "no law will be assented to which sanctions any condition of service or residence of a servile character." But, meantime, as Mr. Mackarness pointed out in the debate which followed, the Chinese outrages on the Rand[1] grow worse and worse; and we unite with him in the hope that the Government will forthwith set to work to gradually repatriate the coolies. At the time of writing, some 570 Chinamen have applied for repatriation—200 under the old proclamation and 370 under the new—and we trust that there will be no unnecessary delay in sending them back to their own country. While dealing with this question of Chinese slavery, we may note that Reuter, under date "Washington, August 10," informs us that "Chinese labour will be given a thorough test in the construction of the Panama Canal," and that already "contracts for 2500 coolies have been prepared." From Victoria, British Columbia, Reuter reports that "a considerable number of Hindoos will be imported into the province to relieve the labour situation," and that "Mr. Whyte, Vice-President of the Canadian Pacific Railroad, . . . believes that Chinese coolies should be admitted, under restrictions as to their sphere of labour." It remains to be seen whether the people of the United States will sanction Chinese slavery at Panama. Hindoo coolies, being British subjects, cannot be employed under servile conditions; and we cannot but believe that Canada, following the recent example of Newfoundland, would reject any proposal for the introduction of Chinese labour. But, if not, "restrictions as to their sphere of labour" would certainly come under the heading of "conditions of service or residence of a servile character," and as such should, according to the Transvaal precedent just set up, be disallowed by the Home Government.

Native Recruiting Monopoly Broken.

An announcement, almost as welcome as that in regard to Chinese slavery, was made in regard to the recruiting of native labour. The monopoly of recruiting hitherto enjoyed by the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association has been broken down, and equal facilities have been granted to the Robinson group of mines. This new arrangement, it is hoped, "will have the effect of increasing, without abuses, the supplies of native labour; and in the expectation of such an increase (added Mr. Churchill) the Robinson group of mines have notified us that they will forthwith surrender the 3000 outstanding licenses for Chinese which they

[1] ERRATUM.—In last month's note headed "Catalogue of Chinese Crimes," p. 124 line 24, for 87,000 read 870,000.

hold." Amid loud Ministerial cheers, the Under-Secretary for the Colonies further stated that "it will be possible to employ a larger proportion of white men in association with Kaffir labour, but we cannot say now whether it will be 20 or 40 per cent. An experiment is going to be tried at one of the Robinson mines to see how high a proportion of white labour can be employed in association with Kaffir labour. The Government will watch that experiment with interest and sympathy, and the House will realise and believe that it will be an honest and *bonâ-fide* experiment when I say that the man to whom it will be entrusted is Mr. Cresswell." Our readers, we are sure, will wish this experiment every success.

Exit the £30,000,000.

Dealing with the promise obtained by Mr. Joseph Chamberlain from "certain unofficial gentlemen in Johannesburg" that the Transvaal would pay £30,000,000 and the Orange River Colony £5,000,000 in diminution of the War Debt, Mr. Churchill said that "such a promise, of course, had no regular authority." But in consideration of this promise the House of Commons had guaranteed a loan of £35,000,000, and "there would, therefore, seem to be not a legal obligation, but something in the nature of a moral obligation upon those Colonies in respect of this contribution." They had no desire, however, "to deal in a grasping spirit with the youngest Colonies in the British Empire," and possibly some arrangement might be made on the lines of the "guarantors—those who promised to underwrite the first £10,000,000 at 4 per cent.," agreeing to "transfer their obligation to a loan considerably smaller, to be expended, indeed, not in relieving the British taxpayer or reducing the National Debt, but to be expended on certain South African objects, which are agreeable both to the British and Boer populations, and in which his Majesty's present advisers take a keen and lively interest."

Unworthy, Mischievous, Unpatriotic.

Mr. Churchill concluded his able and statesmanlike speech with an appeal to the Opposition to unite with the Government in making the gift of Responsible Government to the Transvaal a National and not merely a Party gift, adding, however, that in any case the Government were "prepared to go forward alone." But his appeal, eloquent as it was, met with no response. Just as in the Lords Lord Milner had condemned the course which the Government had taken as one which "might result in handing over the Government of the Transvaal to Mr. Botha and Mr. Smuts"—a result at least preferable to handing the Transvaal over to the tender mercies of "the -eits and the -eins" and their Chinese serfs, Mr. Lyttleton, in the Commons, contended that "the Under-

Secretary had not advanced one single argument which attempted to justify the launching of so great an experiment amid such explosive material," and, as the *Tribune*[1] puts it, "he proceeded to amaze even his own friends by trying to scare the country with the reminder that there are 15,000 German troops in German South Africa with seventy-three guns and an unstated number of Boer volunteers." Mr. Balfour followed this reckless lead, and in the course of a vituperative speech declared that "there was nothing to prevent the new Assembly making every preparation, constitutionally and quietly, for a new war." He sat down at a minute to ten, leaving the Premier only sixty seconds in which to reply. But Sir Henry was equal to the occasion, for speaking just as "the guillotine" fell, and amid loud cheers and great disorder, he vigorously characterised the ex-Premier's speech as the most unworthy, mischievous, and unpatriotic he had ever listened to.

Progress of the Peace Movement.

The great progress in recent years of the movement for the promotion of international peace and arbitration was illustrated by the meetings of the fourteenth Inter-Parliamentary Conference held at Westminster Palace on July 23, 24 and 25 last. Not only has the membership of the Conference itself increased by leaps and bounds, but, as Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman stated in the speech in which he welcomed the Conference on behalf of the King, the Government, and the nation, there are now in existence no less than thirty-eight arbitration agreements between the different Powers, all of which have been framed since October, 1903, and ten of which have been entered into between our own and other countries. Sir Henry assured the Conference that the Government "unreservedly associated themselves with the purpose of their mission" and called upon those present to "urge their Governments in the name of humanity to go into the Hague Conference, as we ourselves hope to go, pledged to diminished charges in regard to armaments." On July 27 the good faith of this appeal was demonstrated by the announcement of Mr. Edmund Robertson (Secretary to the Admiralty) of the reduction of our naval programme by one armoured vessel of the *Dreadnought* type, and three ocean-going coastal destroyers, involving a total saving of £2,500,000. As regards existing arbitration treaties Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman pointed out that they contain a "proviso which debars the reference to arbitration of matters affecting the vital interests, the independence, or the honour of the two contracting States," and he urged that if possible the scope of the treaties should be extended. This was supported in an eloquent speech by the Hon. W. J. Bryan, the great American

[1] August 1, 1906.

orator, who argued that an investigation of the facts of a dispute, and their separation from the question of honour, would end in the settlement of both, and that the investigation would further afford time for reflection, deliberation, and converse, and "give opportunity to mobilise public opinion for the compelling of a peaceful settlement." As a result a resolution endorsing these views was carried unanimously.

"Long Live the Duma!"

The most dramatic scene at the conference, however, was that which occurred when Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, extending a welcome from the Mother of Parliaments to the representatives of the youngest of Parliaments—the Russian Duma, the dissolution of which had been announced only a few hours before—said: "I make no comment on the news which has reached us this morning; this is neither the place nor the moment for that. We have not a sufficient acquaintance with the facts to be in a position to justify or criticise. But this at least we can say, we who base our confidence and our hopes on the Parliamentary system—new institutions have often a disturbed, if not a stormy youth. The Duma will revive in one form or another. We can say with all sincerity, 'The Duma is dead; long live the Duma.'" Loud were the cheers and great the enthusiasm evoked by this bold pronouncement. The dissolution of the Duma was, indeed, accompanied by an announcement that the elections for a second Duma will take place next spring. Meanwhile, in spite of the dissolution, the members of the first Duma are keeping in touch with each other as far as circumstances permit, and are endeavouring, as far as possible, to give their country a lead during the even more troublous times upon which it has entered. A manifesto issued by a largely attended conference of members of the Duma, chiefly of the Constitutional Democratic Party, held at Viborg, attributes the dissolution of the Duma to the urgent demand for the enactment of "a law respecting the distribution of land to the working peasants, and involving the assignment to this end of the Crown Appanages, the Cabinet monastries, and the lands belonging to the clergy, and the compulsory ex-propriation of private estates." It is pointed out that while "the Government promises to convoke a new Duma seven months hence," this means that "for seven months the Government will act arbitrarily, and will fight against the popular movement in order to obtain a pliable and subservient Duma," and that "should it succeed . . . in completely suppressing the popular movement, the Government will convoke no Duma at all." And the manifesto concludes by urging the people to repudiate any loans the government may contract without the consent of the Duma, and "not to give a kopeck to the throne or a soldier

to the army" "until the popular representatives are summoned." The policy outlined is one of passive resistance, but unhappily a projected general strike has broken down for want of adequate organisation, and mutinies at Sveaborg, Helsingfors, Cronstadt—(small wonder that it was not considered safe for the British fleet to visit the Baltic)—and other centres have been suppressed by the strong hand. The outlook is gloomy in the extreme, but the bureaucracy will yet discover that even in Russia "force is no remedy," and the lack of funds and the very evident sympathy of Western Europe with the cause of the people may very conceivably compel the Czar to call the Duma to his aid long before the spring, and to grant to his long-suffering subjects really substantial reforms. Strangely enough, at the very time that the Duma is dissolved, the Shah of Persia, troubled by internal dissensions, and largely influenced by the example of Russia, has at length conceded the popular demand by establishing a National Council, comprising representatives of all classes from princes to tradesmen. Should this new departure prove successful, as we hope it may, Persia in her turn will afford her great neighbour an object-lesson that may well have the happiest influence upon Russia's future destiny. It would appear that not only Persia but—wonder of wonders!—China also is to have a Parliament. A Reuter's telegram, dated Peking, August 21, tells us that "The Commissioners who recently returned from their tour abroad recommend a gradual change to Constitutional Government, taking ten or fifteen years to educate the people to adapt themselves to the new *régime*."

SLUM ENVIRONMENT AND SOCIAL CAUSATION.

I.

In Germany, France, Italy and the United States much is being done towards establishing scientific views of social causation; but in this country the progress of social science is still very slow, and it need not be a matter for surprise that wholly erroneous views on social questions are still widely entertained, even among people of the tolerably educated classes. For many years the theory that total degeneracy is but the natural outcome of the inherent wickedness of mankind has been accepted by many with complacency, and the acceptance of this theory has constituted one of the most formidable obstacles to social progress. Among the upper and middle classes it has engendered a widespread spirit of apathy and indifference to existing social conditions, and among the poor themselves it has served to deepen the hopelessness which is created by continued social injustice and persistent social disease.

It seems almost unnecessary to say that this theory is due to a mistaken conception of life—to a futile and foolish attempt to separate the individual from the conditions under which he lives. While individual regeneration is, and must always be, the most potent influence towards the raising of mankind, the improvement of the individual *as a real social factor* is impossible apart from improvement in the general conditions of life.

The first step, then, towards any lasting social improvement is to ascertain as definitely as possible the actual nature of social conditions. In the past, social reformers, in their anxiety to ameliorate the misery they have seen around them, have seldom stopped to study cause and effect minutely, and the result has been that they have frequently entirely misapprehended the actual cause of the condition of things they have sought to change. And so it has been that the self-sacrificing labours of many of these good people have been in vain, and have even seriously hindered reform.

If there is to be any social advancement, the tendency of nature to produce certain effects under certain conditions will have to be more seriously regarded. It will have to be recognised that the

conditions under which man, as a social being, lives constitute the main influence in determining the ways of life of the majority, if not relatively of all.

In recent times attention has been too much concentrated on purely material activities, and the time has come when some of the energy and brains hitherto devoted to material advancement must be exercised towards social improvement. We are too little conscious that we have in our great cities a vast population of human beings who are gravely imperfect mentally, morally, and even physically. Those people of ours have done their part towards building up the material nation; they have contributed towards the raising of our power and our influence in the world. But what has been their reward? They are obliged to live in an evil environment in which it is barely possible to lead a reasonable life. Debilitated and enervated by long hours of work, bad living conditions, adulterated food, and the horrible temptations of the slums, these people have become so debased that to raise them seems about impossible. Yet in the face of all this it is cynically said that nowadays the masses have ample opportunities of educating and elevating themselves if they would only take advantage of such opportunities. This attitude towards prevailing social conditions is due to ignorance of life in the lower grades of society, not to say want of knowledge of the mental and moral conditions of those who have been conceived, born, and brought up under unfavourable conditions. It is the attitude of the confirmed reactionary. It is the excuse of the selfish well-to-do classes for their disregard of the interests of their less fortunate fellow creatures. It matters but little what kind of educational system is in vogue, or what opportunities are afforded for the cultivation of character or morals if the people who are ignorant, and devoid of character and loose in morals, are incapable of appreciating the advantages of, or necessity for mental and moral improvement. Now, the first causes of this incapability of the people to appreciate the necessity for individual or social improvement must be carefully inquired into. Not only must what may be called direct influences—such as unsatisfactory housing and surroundings, over-population, difficulties due to irregularity of employment, intemperance, the ill-regulated distribution of charity, and the rest—be thoroughly investigated, but influences of a congenital character must also be minutely studied. The extent of the influence on the present generation of slum people of the surroundings, ideas, tastes, and the general mental, moral, and even physical conditions of their progenitors, are factors which must be seriously considered. If an attempt is made to determine, relatively, the extent of these congenital influences, it will be easier to understand the apparent inability of the people of our slums to

resist the temptations and withstand the social diseases by which they are beset from the cradle to the grave; and likewise it will be easier to properly appreciate the indisposition of those people to leave the slum districts, or to change in any way their modes of life.

In places where conditions of social congestion have long existed it is not difficult to perceive the awful influences which overcrowding has exerted on the people. It has been stated that in Edinburgh, which is more of a residential than an industrial town, that "out of a total of 71,504 families, in the year 1901, 34,631, or 48 per cent. of the whole, lived in houses of one or two rooms per family. Over 67,000 persons lived three or more to a room . . . and one-third lived more than two persons to a room."

If the conditions are not worse now than they were in 1901 they are probably no better. The greatest evil of this close association is that home life is utterly destroyed; and the tendency of the life is to keep all on the same social level. I have observed in the slums of Edinburgh that comfortably situated families seldom have any association with their neighbours. They live in higher-rented houses than the mass of the inhabitants, and, through their isolation, they are enabled to enjoy a certain degree of privacy.

The children of those respectable families are, however, frequently unhealthy, and this is no doubt chiefly due to want of exercise and fresh air. On the other hand, the children of worthless parents are often found to be robust. The children of the worthless have unlimited freedom, and in spite of the disadvantages of this, their almost constant life outside does much to fortify them against such prevailing diseases as phthisis.

In a report on the condition of the poor of Dundee in 1904, the percentages of overcrowded people living in three rooms and under in the large Scottish towns are given as follows:

Edinburgh	59.1
Aberdeen	69.2
Glasgow	74.1
Dundee	83.2

These figures are sufficient denunciation of the conditions under which masses of the Scottish people are living.

"For a right condition of society the ethical state of adults should be higher and more advanced than that of children, on the average; that is to say, their training and experience of life should improve them. At present it is the reverse, and children, on the average, are born into the world better than in a few years they become. The majority seem to have suffered deterioration, not elevation, from their social surroundings. Their training has on the whole been bad. He hoped that might be false, but if it were true it was a grievous indictment against the conditions under which they lived. A great responsibility

rests upon those commercial requirements, and those laws of land-ownership which have brought large towns into being, and crowded the population into dense tenements. The result of the ugly, squalid, hard-pressed life which the majority of people have to lead is that a minority of them not only fail to advance, but go back in the scale of civilisation to a dangerous and intolerable extent, so that an elaborate machinery of coercion has to be employed in order to deal with the vice and crime which misery has, to a large extent, created. The present state of things, therefore, is far from economical, and besides heavily adding to the burden of the rates, it weighs constantly upon the souls of all those who might otherwise be capable of enjoying life in a free, unselfish, and vigorous manner."[1]

This is a very frank admission of the influence of environment upon our people. How difficult it must be for those who have always lived in surroundings such as the surroundings of the slums of our great cities, and whose progenitors have probably lived under comparatively the same conditions for generations, to resist the influences which are inseparable from that environment. Until the homes and surroundings of the people are radically improved many of the efforts now being made to raise the masses will have but partial success.

II.

Many important phases of the social problem have been neglected in recent years, but no phase has been so effectually pushed into the background as the question of population. A question in itself of great difficulty, the population question is so closely associated with that of slum environment that it is impossible, with any semblance of straightforwardness, to pass it over, as has, for some time, been the popular custom.

In the slum districts of our cities the majority of the people belong to the labouring and unskilled classes of workers. The wages of most of the men of these classes are as high about nineteen or twenty years of age as at any time during life. Now marriage very frequently takes place before twenty, and as the young men have but little money saved at so early an age the married life is commenced in a house of one room, in a tenement, provided with but the barest necessities. As the needs of the home thus started in poverty, increase, without any increase in the income, the position of the family does not improve, and when periods of idleness and sickness, come circumstances become precarious.

It should perhaps be noted here that although the wages of the artisan classes have increased in recent years, and may still increase, the improvement in the wages of labourers and unskilled workers generally has been infinitesimal, if there has been any improvement

[1] Sir Oliver Lodge, "Address on Social Regeneration."

at all. Nor are the wages of the labouring classes likely to be appreciably increased so long as there is so much surplus unskilled labour in the large cities. It should not be ignored that the tendency to very early marriage among the people of the slums, with its dreadful influence in unduly increasing the already dangerously large slum population, is one of the greatest obstacles to social progress. Indeed to this must be traced the creation of much of the surplus unskilled labour which is so largely responsible for the distress of the casual labouring class, if not the augmentation of the loafers and criminal classes.

III.

While the effects of intemperance are so apalling in the slums of our great cities that it would be difficult to overstate them, it is sometimes too hastily assumed that if something could be done to control the liquor traffic, and so to wean the people from drinking habits that the social question would be practically solved. Intemperance is no doubt the most striking influence *directly* responsible for social degeneracy, but in the present state of social knowledge it is not possible to say how far intemperance is a cause and how it is an effect of existing social conditions. With every desire to fight the influences of drink it is not possible to accept the popular theory that intemperance and the degenerate habits of the people generally constitutes the whole social problem. Very often degenerate habits are but manifestations of causes which are far below the surface.

At a Church Congress meeting at Weymouth in October 1904, the Governor of Dartmoor Prison said:

> "It was the fashion to assert that if it were not for drink our prisons would be empty, but the statement was fallacious. Drink had much to answer for, perhaps one-half of the crimes of passion might be traced to it, but with professional crime it had little to do. For that they must look to the home, to the decay of parental control, to the waning sense of responsibility of fathers towards their children. That was the evil in which vagrancy as well as crime germinated, and as long as there were foolish and negligent parents those noxious weeds would grow."

Let everything possible be done to obtain complete control over the influence of the brewer, the distiller, the publican, and others of that class, but let it not be supposed that the influences of alcohol constitute the one cause of social disease and social wrong.

IV.

Few questions relative to the poor are so difficult to deal with as the question of charity. The very necessity for charity

is in itself a great social evil, but in the present condition of society we must recognise that a certain amount of relief in some form is absolutely necessary. To be dependent upon alms is not a condition calculated to aid in the development of character and morals, but this is the normal condition of many of our people, and we must deal with it as it exists. A large amount of money is spent in charity every year, and unfortunately it is not spent to the best advantage. It is strewn indiscriminately through the slums by well-meaning but misguided people. Great harm is being done in the spending of much of this money, and for years those responsible for the distribution of alms have unconsciously been doing their best to teach a small army of people that they have no need to make any effort to work. Money is being showered into the slums in the most indiscriminate and foolish way, and the condition of mind which this well-intentioned folly has created among the poor is appalling beyond description.

V.

But all these evils are in no inconsiderable degree the outcome of public disregard of social conditions. In recent years the public mind has been constantly diverted from social questions through the focussing of attention on Imperial questions; but there is at last, happily, some reason to hope that an interest in the condition of the people, such as has not in modern times been known, will ere long become manifest in this country. It will probably be acknowledged by all, whatever their views of Imperial politics may be, that the social question generally has never received the attention which it demands, and the neglect must, at least to some extent, be said to be due to the inordinate interest, and almost exclusive attention, given to Imperial and foreign affairs. But the disinclination of the people to become seriously interested in social questions has also been largely due to the disorganisation which has existed, and still exists, among those who have affected to make social questions their chief interest. It must be apparent to all who interest themselves closely in social movements that until social questions are approached in a more rational spirit it is idle to hope that much can be done to effect any permanent improvement in conditions.

VI.

The social problem must be regarded as chiefly a problem of conditions, and not a problem of individual regeneration apart from, or independent of conditions. Plants and animals are grown, or bred

in a degree of perfection or imperfection strictly in keeping with conditions. And so it is in the social sphere. The perfection or imperfection of an individual or a class is more dependent on environment than on any other influence—on mental and moral, as well as physical, environment, and it is only by rendering the environment of a people in every respect favourable to healthy creation and development, and so to individual and social improvement that anything approaching the desirable social condition can be realised.

There is no greater social curse at the present time than the herding of the people in insanitary sub-divided tenements. The horror of it all is that it is those who work at the most arduous toil, and who receive the lowest return for their work, who are most susceptible to the influences which result in social degeneracy. It is impossible to ignore the fact that the economic side of the social question presents almost insuperable difficulties, for whatever measures may be adopted towards improving surroundings, the uses which society, as it is at present organised, has for the poor, and even for the shiftless and degenerate poor, must remain a great obstacle to improvement.

If the struggle which is characteristic of all life is to be, in the social sphere, what it should be, a competition for the attainment of the highest qualities which man is capable of, there must be more equitable and better conditions of life for the masses. What is so pitiful in the condition of the poor and miserable as the dreadful monotony of their lives? No acquaintance with literature, art, or any refining influence, no mental outlook, no secial ideal, nothing but hopelessness and despair on every hand. We have preached to the peeple, but they have not responded to us because they have not understood us!

There are those who tell us that the submerged classes are not so unhappy nor so miserable as is supposed. This is true, but is their condition not one of the signs of the depths of misery in which the people are sunk? Why, the greatest difficulty of reformers will be to arouse the masses from the mental and moral stupor which their lives have induced.

Now it will be clear that my thesis is that while the social problem must always be recognised as partially an individual problem, it is chiefly a problem of conditions. Occasionally men and women rise above the influences of their environment, but such cases are exceptional, and must always be exceptional. Look where you will in Nature, and you will find that the influence of environment is practically omnipotent; and if you look closely enough at human environment you will find that the same obtains.

VII

This is not the place to deal with social remedies, for this article is but an attempt at a certain kind of social diagnosis. One of the difficulties of the time is that there are so many suggested remedies for social ills. I suspect that the differences which exist among people who are anxious to see conditions improved are in no small measure due to misconceptions regarding the causes of existing social evils. If the actual causes of the present condition of the lower grades of society were better understood, there would probably be fewer differences as to the remedies required. It is difficult to resist the idea that the primary obstacle to social advancement is the want of definite social knowledge. Why does not every university in this country have a chair of sociology; and why does not every centre of population have its social science association? Even the number of sociological works published in the United Kingdom is grievously limited.

No effort should be spared to gather information on all phases of the social question, nor should the necessity for education in the principles of social science be neglected. Surely the science of society demands as much attention as the material sciences.

One is inclined to wish that we, as a people, had a little less of the propagandist spirit, and a little more enthusiasm for scientific knowledge of social life.

The social enthusiasm of the time is doubtless growing, and this is a hopeful sign; but even social enthusiasm has its dangers. Robespierre and St. Just had sufficient social enthusiasm, and sufficient social idealism; but they misapprehended some of the most important social tendencies. They forgot that enthusiasm for change, and the fervour of a high ideal, could not form a stable basis for a new society when the masses of the people were not prepared for the establishment of a higher society.

In our desires for improvement in the condition of the masses let us guard against hastily prescribing remedies for the hastily assumed causes of social inequitability and social disease. Let us pay close attention to the working of social laws.

VIII.

Professor Giddings has said:

"that the sociologist has three main quests. First, he must try to discover the conditions that determine mere aggregation and concourse. Secondly, he must try to discover the law that governs social choices.

Thirdly, he must try to discover the law that governs the natural selection and survival of choices."

To reflect for a moment on the work here outlined is to be impressed by the magnitude and difficulty of social questions so often thought easy. It is, of course, true that the very existence of civilised society means a continual state of warfare with the cosmic process, or with what has been called the state of Nature. Every effort to protect and preserve the weak and to mould conditions in keeping with altruistic ideas increases the necessity for constant vigilance, if what are called civilised conditions are to prevail. Be the more humane conditions of social life, which it is the desire of all reformers to see realised, calculated to be ultimately advantageous to mankind, or the reverse, and there are still differences of opinion on this point, we have gone so far on altruistic lines that it is impossible not to go on. So far as civilised man is concerned the cosmic process has been successfully baffled for the time; but there is grave reason to fear that in the attempt to overcome the influence of the state of Nature social conditions have been rendered too artificial. Out of these modern artificial conditions has come a state of things which it will take generations to overcome, if it can ever be overcome. What succeeding social conditions will be it is impossible to divine, but no one will be bold enough to say that no serious social difficulties will then be experienced. There is some reason to fear that out of conditions whose existence depends upon the complete mastery over the tendencies of Nature will constantly arise problems of great magnitude. The price then of human progress along present lines is constant war with the cosmic process on the one hand, and with artificial tendencies on the other.

ROBERT GUNN DAVIS.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: DOMINANCY OR JUSTICE.

ALL intelligent persons, without regard to party connection or nationality, must agree as to the folly of the present state of rivalry in naval forces among the great nations. Another thing that is obvious is that the increase cannot continue for a long period at its present rate. The annual expenditure on our navy has risen from £17,545,000 in 1895 to £37,000,000 in 1905, an increase of nearly twenty millions in ten years. At this rate it will be fifty-seven millions ten years hence, an amount equal to the total cost of the army and navy along with Civil Administration and the Civil List in 1890. Even at this figure, it will not, by itself, break the nation's back; but, considering the need of money for other purposes, it is now, as is generally recognised, a matter calling for the most serious attention. And we have no reasonable assurance that this expenditure will not continue to increase, even at a rate exceeding that of the last decade. Our present Government have within the last months given a little check to the speed, but to suppose this to be the beginning of a permanent reduction would be childish, unless we cause some radical change of policy which is not yet in view. Our nation is committed to a policy—one which no Government dare disregard without an express mandate from the nation—which, however reluctant they may be, may force the most peace-loving Government to an increase far exceeding that of recent years. It is, as Lord Lansdowne frankly confessed in the recent debate following Lord Avebury's question on armaments, "a policy which, pursued to the bitter end, must drive us into bankruptcy." We have a grave danger before us, as every thinking man must admit. How are we going to meet it?

The subject perhaps becomes somewhat trite; but we shall not, if we are wise, leave the problem to make its own solution. The situation is a standing challenge to our intellect; and though we must expect that there will continue to be the same diversity of opinion on this as on all other great public questions, it is not unreasonable to believe that every earnest effort will bring us nearer to the truth and help toward a solution.

What is the cause of this great increase of expenditure on our navy? The two-Power standard has almost become, as it were, a

part of the Constitution. If, for the purpose of inquiry, one should put aside the assumption that we are entitled to keep a naval force equal to the combined navies of any other two nations, will it be accounted treason? We need a naval force for the defence of our country; and prudence requires it to be adequate to probable needs. But what is there to justify this assumption that we are entitled to keep a navy equal to any other two? We have an extensive and scattered Empire to protect; we have a shipping trade far greater than that of any other nation; and, what is most important, we are dependent on over-sea food. In the necessity of guarding our food supply, and of protecting our shipping, there is a good reason why we should desire to have an efficient and adequate navy. But is it not a rash assumption to take as our standard the equivalent of any other two navies? Seen from our own point of view, it seems a very satisfactory arrangement: we cannot make our position too secure. But it is an arrangement which cannot be agreeable to other nations. There are other nations which, if not dependent on over-sea food, yet have great interests on the sea, and these can never acquiesce in an arrangement which gives them no chance in a sea conflict. If these should be so ambitious—and it is not an unreasonable ambition—as to determine to have a navy of such a size as to have a reasonable chance of success in conflict with any other, then, by our adherence to this standard, a rivalry begins, which, if not by some means arrested, can have no other end but ruin.

One acknowledged fact of this situation is that increase is reciprocal: that as we have our eyes fixed on the naval construction of other nations, so they closely watch what we are doing; and that as, by our openly-proclaimed policy, we build additional vessels to keep up to our standard when we see other nations building, so do they strive to match any increase on our part. Knowing this, it would appear that common sense would tell us, that having fixed our standard, we should be very careful not to exceed it, since such excess will only provoke other nations to build to meet it, and thus the extra expenditure will defeat itself and give us no advantage. Have we used such care? No. We have kept on increasing and increasing in disregard of the standard, until now, according to recent official returns, we have a navy equal to the combined navies of any other three nations. What censure can be too strong for such recklessness? And now, when our new Government announce a check to this excessive rate of increase, the members of the late Government who are responsible for it raise cries of alarm: it is "risking national catastrophe," and "shaking the foundations of the peace of the world." (One notable feature of the recent debates on naval affairs in Parliament was the ignoring of this excess by the members of the late Government. Mr. Lee, in spite of the

recent official returns, and not controverting them, actually said we are not quite up to the two-Power standard.) The naive utterance of Mr. Lee, in the debate on the Navy Estimates, that "there had been no reduction in foreign shipbuilding programmes; on the contrary, there had been a marked increase since the Cawdor Memorandum was issued," not only furnishes an illustration of this reciprocal influence, but seems to indicate that some of the members of the late Government failed to realise it.

The recent Parliamentary debates have thrown light on the attitude of that section of our statesmen who have been setting the lead in this race to ruin. Mr. Balfour's interpretation of the two-Power standard, as he gave it on August 2, is that "there should not be a strict mathematical equality with any two Powers, but a margin of safety without which we could not contemplate with serenity a struggle on which the very existence of the country depended." "The principle" (the two-Power standard), said Mr. Pretyman (when Secretary to the Admiralty), "must be broadly applied." It has been broadly applied; and we have got a very considerable "margin of safety." And this margin lets out the truth. Having assured ourselves of success against any one nation by making our navy equal to any other two, we were not then content when we thought of the possibility of conflict with two, but desired such a "margin" as would enable us to fight two—to use Mr. Balfour's illuminating word—with "serenity." The logical end of this attitude is that expressed by Viscount Goschen in the House of Lords: "The naval policy of this country must be proportionate not only to the naval policy of two Powers, but it must be proportionate to all the navies of the world. The old standard was too low and inadequate to the change of circumstances." But it is questionable whether even this could be regarded as satisfactory; whether we ought not to have such a margin as would allow us to contemplate a fight with the combined navies of the world with serenity. The fact is, there is a section of our statesmen who wish not merely to be able to crush any nation who may oppose us singly, not merely to have a good chance against the best two, but for nothing less than our complete supremacy and dominancy of the seas. They want to be able to punish by war without being themselves subject to the risks of war; they want to be able to drop a crushing weight on any enemy while they keep safely shielded. (One wonders what the naval heroes of the sixteenth century, accustomed to attack great odds of larger vessels, would think of the policy of the "margin of safety.")

In the *World's Work and Play* of March there appeared an article on the vessel of the new type now being built: "As things are and will be for many years, the *Dreadnought* will be supreme on the seas in the way of being able to overtake any probable opponent

of the battleship class. The gun, Mark xi., should be effective up to 10,000 yards or more. In other words, it ought to hit what it is aimed at five miles off. Hence the panic in Germany over the *Dreadnought*. Of the German fleet ten ships carry guns effective up to 4000 yards perhaps. The ten later ships, built and building, have 11-inch guns, but they are short pieces and probably erratic after 6000 yards or so. In any case, they could not hurt the *Dreadnought* at 8000 yards, while she with her powerful guns and superior speed could disable the Germans one after the other so long as her ammunition lasted."

One can imagine the feelings of Germans and other peoples on their seeing this complacent assumption of dominancy. Mr. Lee said in the Commons: "With regard to ships of the *Dreadnought* type, he contended that it was necessary for us to maintain a first line of defence composed of vessels of that class, because the first country that provided a squadron of such vessels would *ipso facto* secure the undisputed right of the seas." Earl Cawdor spoke in the same sense in the House of Lords: "In regard to battleships, for ten or twelve years hence the nation that owned most ships of the *Dreadnought* type would be the country that would dominate the sea."

The statesmen who uphold this policy repeatedly tell us that our naval force is for defence only; the implication being that it is no menace to other nations; that it will not be used unless they attack us; in other words, that it is only to guard against the mischievous propensities of other nations. But this is not true; and it is desirable that our people should understand this dangerous fallacy. Our navy is an instrument with which to assert our authority. The very men who urge this innocent-looking justification of our large navy themselves give the clearest evidence of its fallaciousness, frequently in the same speech. Mr. Balfour urged this view, and he also said: "His belief was that if we meant to have peace in Europe and wished our negotiations to be successful they should not neglect that naval and military backing without which our diplomacy was bound to fail." Lord Lansdowne also said our policy is only one of defence, and he said: "If this country was respected it was because it was understood that, much as we loved peace, we were ready for war, and would take, if necessary, the risk of war." Do not these words acknowledge, what every intelligent man knows to be the fact, that our naval force stands to assert our authority in our dealings with other nations? We have in the famous North Sea incident of the autumn of 1904 an indisputable illustration of the fallacious nature of this defence-only idea. The Russian Baltic Fleet, in a nervous condition, beginning a very hazardous enterprise, mistook Hull trawlers for torpedo boats, and

fired on them, killing two men and sinking one vessel. Our people became highly excited at once, and the newspapers clamoured for punishment; and a fleet was mobilised and held ready to sink the hapless Russians when the word should be given. Speaking at a public meeting a few days later, Mr. Balfour said: "I think I now may say, as certainly I should not have dared to say last night, that this lamentable and deplorable affair will not end in one of those great international struggles . . . which always leave a deplorable mark behind them, and always have the effect of retarding the progress of humanity and civilisation." This Russian fleet had no designs on our shores—no one was quite so wild as to say that; yet we threatened it; and Mr. Balfour made it clear that if the Russian Government had proved tardy or obstinate it was the intention of our Government to strike it. How can it be said, then, that our navy is for defence only? Its purpose is, like that of every military force, to assert our authority and to strike when we wish to strike.

In this aim of some of our statesmen to secure the dominancy of the seas we have the key to the situation. Is our position a rational one? Is it a position in which, judged from a detached point of view, we are justified? If we were dealing with an order of inferior creatures, such a policy would be wise; but we are dealing with men with feelings like our own. This is the fatal feature of this policy: it denies a fair and just standing to other nations. And for this reason it is a policy which must ultimately fail, if it does not bring disaster; for other nations will never acquiesce to our having a dominancy of the seas. Our attitude is one of consummate arrogance. We aim, by maintaining a large navy, as our statesmen tell us, at making our diplomacy "respected." Are we ignorant of the fact that other nations also wish their diplomacy to be respected? How should we take to an attempt on the part of any other nation to gain the dominancy of the seas? As we are men, we should not submit to it. As these over the seas are men, they will not submit to our dominancy. Surely no one is so deluded as to think there is a difference in these cases; that we have a "right" to such a position, while other nations have no such right; that we use our power only to do right, while other nations do not do right? It is not likely to be defended on that ground. It is a policy which springs from that attitude of mind which does not sympathise with, and consequently does not have a just regard of, other nations. And it must engender hatred of us, and thus provoke disaster. The minds of the nations are constantly fixed on this rivalry in making engines of destruction for use against each other; and it is a process which, by irritation and provocation, must engender antagonism. In the words of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, in his address at

the Inter-Parliamentary Conference: "Was it not evident that a process of simultaneous and progressive arming defeated its own purpose? Scare answered to scare, and force begot force, until it came at length to be seen that we were racing one against another after a phantom security which continually vanished as we approached."

Are we going to hold to this policy of dominancy? It is on the answer we give to this question that our future largely depends. If we do hold to it, the end must be disaster. And what is the alternative course? Is it to reduce our naval force to something like an equality with those of other nations? Well, if fighting is the best means of settling affairs of difference between nations, it would be fair to fight on equal terms. But there are men among us who think that civilised nations ought to settle their differences by appeal to a judicial authority, even as individual citizens do, and these will certainly say that the best alternative is to agree to settle all differences between ourselves and other nations by arbitration. This course would be far more effective in securing peace to us than large armaments.

It is a defect of some of our statesmen that they fail to understand the human element in the situation. They regard other nations not as our fellow-men, but as beings of another nature. They are insular; their sympathy does not extend beyond the boundary of our own country. The following words give Mr. Balfour's estimate of the barbarians: "One policy, and one policy alone, will ensure peace as far as we are concerned, namely, the conviction entertained by every foreign statesman that it is dangerous to attack us." This means that other nations would attack us if they dared; that they are only kept off by fear. They are bad men. On the other hand, we keep our navy for defence only; we have no intentions against them such as they have against us. We are good. Is not this a pitiable partiality? Is it possible for a statesman having such views to deal successfully with foreign nations? To disallow the imputation contained in Mr. Balfour's words is not necessarily to assume that all foreign people are saints. Let us know men for what they really are: let the villain be called a villain, but let us avoid distorting fact by prejudice. What the character of other European nations is we know. What their morality is we see from their daily life in their respective lands. And we know well that an estimate of the difference in character between our own and other people's such as that instanced is preposterous. Machiavelli wrote: "Men will always be false to you unless compelled by necessity to be true." Doubtless Machiavelli thought himself astute; but we don't value these words as expressing a true knowledge of human nature, but only as revealing the character of the writer and the

morality of his time. Who dare say that, before as much more time has elapsed as since Machiavelli penned these words, the foregoing utterance of Mr. Balfour will not be placed in the same category?

Many of our statesmen are not so wanting in knowledge of the world as to be deluded by the talk about peace. They know that men have talked about peace for a thousand years; and they are not so simple as to think that the era of universal peace has come yet. In rejecting utopian hopes they are wise; but their mistake is that they don't see the changes that have actually taken place, and the abnormal nature of the present situation of the great nations. There has been a great change of sentiment in the nations of Europe, and the old barriers between them are fast crumbling away; while the military situation itself tends to drive them to mutual understanding in order to avoid disaster.

Happily, not all our statesmen are of this mould. Now we have as Premier a man who is in actual touch with that ever-welling thought and sentiment which carries human society forward and upward; who perceives that social institutions rest on ideas which are susceptible of change, and that old orders *must* give way to new; who has had the courage to suggest to the nations, as one in a position to give effect to the suggestion, a complete reversal of international policy, and dared to express his hearty sympathy with another struggling people as fellow-men. There are indications that our people are beginning to see the folly and danger of the present situation; and a faith begins to rise in us that reason and goodwill will prevail; that the threatening storm-elements may be dispersed before they bring disaster; and that the day is not far distant when the nations of Europe, looking back at the preparations for mutual destruction of the present day in incredulous wonder, shall live in harmony and work in glad co-operation in raising the general standard of life.

HARRY HODGSON.

COBDEN, CIVILISATION AND COMMERCE.

A FORGOTTEN controversy in which Richard Cobden took part deserves to be recalled in these days when the relation of Great Britain to what are conventionally styled "inferior races" frequently comes before the bar of public conscience.

The "Society for the Extinction of the Slave Trade and the Civilisation of Africa" was started by Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, who proposed the placing of an efficient force on the coast of Africa, treaties with native chiefs, the purchase of Fernando Po by the British Government, the despatch of an expedition up the Niger, and the formation of a company for the introduction of agriculture and commerce into Africa. On October 26, 1840, a meeting was held in Manchester to form a branch of this Association. There was a great gathering of notables, and the chair was taken by Dr. William Herbert, the then Dean of Manchester, who before he entered holy orders had, as a member of the House of Commons, been an opponent of the slave trade. The speakers included Sir George Murray, Dr. Lushington, and the Rev. Richard Parkinson. There was another meeting of a more popular kind in the evening, with the Dean again in the chair. After the Rev. T. W. Trew, Sir George Murray, Mr. Richard Birley, Joseph Brotherton, M.P., the Rev. Dr. Halley, and the Rev. James Dixon had spoken, Cobden intervened.

Mr. RICHARD COBDEN said, at his own request the Chairman had been polite enough to allow him to address a few words to the meeting. They would hardly suppose that he had not come there to advocate the objects which every speaker had advocated. He had been in countries where slaves were sold; he had seen the slave market of Alexandria; he had visited slaves, and sojourned among them in America; and he had returned a hater of slavery. But he wished to ask, what were the practical means by which this great cause was to be carried out? and he would tell them why he asked it. He read in a little paper that was put into his hands a statement that upwards of thirty years and more than fifteen millions of money had been consumed in fruitless attempts to put down the slave trade; but it had doubled during that period. The annual loss of life had risen from 17 to 25 per

cent.; 175,000 human beings were being annually reduced to slavery; 330,000 more annually perish, that the annual loss to Africa was 250,000 human beings. Did he despair? No; but he said that the failure of past attempts ought to caution us to be very careful as to the means we were now going to adopt. The means we had hitherto taken had been by armed cruisers and establishing forts on the territory. We had, as we had heard, in Sierra Leone a fortress—the "White Man's Grave,"—where tens of thousands of widows and orphans had been created, and where the European went merely to perish. Well, the gentleman had told them that it had had the effect of keeping off the slave-hunter for 300 miles from that region. But had it put down the slave trade? No: it was transferred to another portion of the coast, from which it was less difficult to convey them; and the consequence had been that, whilst the lives of Englishmen had been lost, and fifteen millions of treasure had been consumed, slavery had increased.

These, he continued, were facts which must make us use our intellects in the midst of our feelings, and ask what were the best means to be pursued. He was opposed to State interference in an object of this kind; and he would tell them why, if they wished for further argument than was to be found in the little paper he had in his hand. They would be astonished to learn that the slave trade was carried on with equal activity in Europe as in Africa. He had seen black and white slaves offered for sale in the fair city of Constantinople, and that state of things was supported and avowedly maintained by the State policy of England. At the very time we had been told of the atrocities committed by the slave trade off the African coast, murders were daily perpetrated off the coast of America. A traffic was carried on in slaves from Alexandria to Constantinople in European vessels. He had sailed on board a Sardinian brig which was conveying black slaves to Constantinople; and a friend of his, within twelve months had gone to Smyrna in a vessel, the ladies' cabin of which was occupied by twelve young Circassian boys on their way to the harem of the Pasha at Alexandria. He mentioned these facts to show that any State policy could not be just which could at one end of Africa avowedly uphold such a state of things, and even devote a navy at this moment to keep up this state of things, while, in another part of Africa, it furnished cruisers and spent money under pretence of putting down slavery. If they took possession of the territory on the river Niger (and he believed that would be done), not only would a greater loss of life be incurred than at Sierra Leone—for those alluvial lands were most pestilential—but they would only transfer the slave trade to another part of the coast, while by their occupation of the territory they would create jealousy on the part of other nations; and French, English, and Americans might be

fighting their battles again on the banks of the Niger. He believed that, for the suppression of the slave trade, the expression of the public opinion of England would do far more than either the intrigues of statesmen or the menaces of fleets. He had purposely addressed these remarks to the meeting before Dr. Lushington spoke, because he thought it but candid that the doctor should have an opportunity of following him. £50,000 or £60,000 had been voted by Parliament to send an expedition, in connection with this society, to the Niger; and it was because this had been done, and because he highly disapproved of such a system of State policy, that he ventured to enter his individual protest against the expenditure of the money of the taxpayers of this country upon such an object. (Hisses, followed by applause.) He would subscribe his money, and was there to entreat others to do so, towards the society; but he objected to the money of the taxpayers of this country being voted for it——

The CHAIRMAN: I feel it is my duty to call the gentleman to order. I apprehend that this meeting was called for the purpose of considering the propriety of forming an auxiliary branch to the one first established in London—(hear, hear)—and not for the purpose of considering the acts of the administration in the expenditure of the public money.

Mr. COBDEN: Mr. Bunting has applied to me as to what I said to him. I told Mr. Bunting, as I told the Chairman, that I am favourable to the objects of the meeting; but that I hold the means by which such objects should be attained to be legitimate subjects of discussion this evening.

The CHAIRMAN said he must again call on the gentleman to confine himself within the proper limits of the discussion.

Mr. COBDEN said he would bow to the decision of the Chairman. Would he be allowed to argue on the future without comment on the past? If so, he would offer it as his humble opinion, that to carry out objects of this nature could not be done, with justice to the people of this nation, by granting sums from the consolidated fund for such an object. And to do what? To civilise a country 4,000 miles long, 2,000 miles wide; possessing a territory of eight millions of square miles, 2½ millions of which are utterly unknown to Europeans. He entered his protest against the beginning and against the continuance of such a system. (Hisses.)

The CHAIRMAN again called Mr. Cobden to order, observing that the meeting was not considering the propriety of applying any public money to such purposes.

Mr. COBDEN, amidst cries of "Sit down" and "Go on," said, as that subject, to use an African phrase, had been *tabooed* by their excellent Chairman, he would just state, if he might be allowed, what he thought the best means for carrying out the objects of

the society. Not by attempting to carry on trade without a profit, but to give every encouragement to that trade which carried with it a profit, and which could alone be continuous. Let every facility be given to trade; and these facilities were not to be found in Acts of Parliament, nor in abstract reasonings of this kind, but in freeing trade from every restriction and monopoly.

The Rev. J. M. TREW said, addressing the Chairman: When the gentleman went before you and requested permission to speak, he pledged his word of honour distinctly to me, that he would not make use of any expressions likely to produce difference of opinion upon the present occasion. ("Off, off," "Hear him out.")

Mr. COBDEN: I have to say to that gentleman most distinctly, that I made no such promise.

Mr. T. P. BUNTING: Then I beg most distinctly to reiterate that Mr. Cobden pledged himself to me, that he would introduce nothing that could create disunion or division of opinion in this meeting.

Mr. COBDEN: On the contrary, I most expressly stipulated to be allowed to speak before Dr. Lushington, that he might have an opportunity of answering what I said.

The CHAIRMAN entreated a patient hearing for Mr. Cobden provided he kept within the proper limits of discussion; and then he hoped they would hear Dr. Lushington answer him. (Applause.)

Mr. COBDEN, having thanked the Chairman, said he had made no such compact as stated by Mr. Bunting and the other gentleman. On the contrary he told them that his remarks must tend to discussion, and so to elicit the truth.

Mr. T. P. BUNTING again rose to order, amid much noise and confusion; and Dr. HALLEY proposed that Dr. Lushington should be heard, and then all who liked might stay to hear Mr. Cobden.

Mr. COBDEN, after order had been restored, said he considered any attempt to foster or patronise trade, or any attempt to give it a direction other than that which flowed from its own natural impulse, to be altogether unsound and useless. As it was by commerce alone that Europe was civilised—("No," "No")—he would tell these gentlemen that England was civilised by commerce, and commerce only; that the missionaries who came to England came in merchant ships, or they would not have come at all. Rather than attempt to give any direction to trade, he would say, "If you wish to increase it, free it." (Applause, hisses, and groans.)

Mr. Cobden wrote to the *Manchester Guardian* a letter, in which he said:

"When I sent up my card to the Chairman, I distinctly explained that I intended with his permission (but not unless called upon) to offer some observations on the means by which it was proposed to carry out the objects of the society—objects which I and every person must approve.

Some delay occurred before I was invited on the platform; and I was then questioned both by Mr. Bunting and another gentleman as to the course I wished to take in addressing the audience. Seeing that they were a little disconcerted by my offer, and recollecting that Mr. O'Connell had been refused a hearing at the meeting of the parent association in Exeter Hall it struck me that there was some fear of my obtruding my political opinions upon the meeting, and I tendered my word of honour to the gentleman who acted as Secretary that I had no intention of doing so. This declaration was afterwards misrepresented to the meeting. So far from having promised not to say anything that could give rise to discussion I expressly requested to be allowed to speak before Dr. Lushington in order that he might have the opportunity of answering my objections—a proposal that was cordially acceded to by the secretary, who withdrew the fourth resolution from my hand (which he had just before requested me to support), and begged me, with an expression of thanks for my candid explanation, to speak the next after the person who was then addressing the meeting."

This letter is dated October 27. Mr. Bunting's reply was not lacking in pungency. He again flatly contradicts Cobden's statements, and then proceeds:

"Mr. Cobden is of opinion that we were disconcerted by his offer to speak, and adverts to the case of Mr. O'Connell at Exeter Hall. Mr. Cobden may, perhaps, envy Mr. O'Connell's distinctions, but he has not yet attained them. I am not aware that we had anything to apprehend from Mr. Cobden's assistance. We may be forgiven if we betrayed some symptoms of surprise at the offer of his assistance—supported as we were by gentlemen of all parties, and especially by gentlemen of Mr. Cobden's own political party, *much his superiors*—as he must bear to be told—*in station, talent and influence.*"

After this courteous observation Mr. Bunting proceeds to compare Mr. Cobden's action with that of the disturbers of meetings—a practice then common—and not yet extinct.

"There will soon be an end," he says, "to all the regulations which secure the proper discharge of a public business, and even to all freedom of public opinion, if, as in the case of the Chartists at several meetings held in this town, and as now in the case of Mr. Cobden, persons professing, it may be a general sympathy with the objects of a meeting, are on that pretext to disturb its order, to introduce discussions totally foreign to those objects, and to gain, at the expense of the time, energy and money of its promoters, an opportunity of advocating some favourite crotchet of their own, too unpopular, perhaps, to command an audience for itself."

After these amiable observations Mr. Bunting disclaims any "sentiment personally disrespectful" to Mr. Cobden, and hopes that "hereafter" he may become a coadjutor of the Manchester Committee.

Mr. Cobden, in another letter, pointed out that his request to speak before Dr. Lushington in order that a reply might be made to his observations showed that he intended there should be a discussion of the methods proposed by the society. He further remarked on Mr. Bunting's letter:

"Something is added by your correspondent upon the subject of my

intrusion upon the meeting by way of comparing it with the proceedings of certain Chartists; to which I need only answer, that I yielded implicit obedience to the chairman even at the time when a majority of that part of the audience who took part in the expression of opinion appealed to support my views, I am, in fact, very anxious that it should be, acknowledged as a rule, that when a public meeting has organised itself (to use an Americanism) by fairly electing its chairman, no individual or number of individuals has any right to dispute his authority. But here let me remark upon the subject of public meetings in Manchester, that they have of late assumed the novel character of ticket or gagged meetings: I have no objection to such a mode of assembling together persons of similar opinions; but the proceedings at those meetings ought not to be put forth as having had the sanction of the public of Manchester; and more especially when all discussion is interdicted under the strictest rules of debate, ought such meetings to moderate the tone in which they publish their proceedings,"[1]

Mr. Bunting returned to the charge, and after repeating his former statements asked, "Will Mr. Cobden let the matter rest now?"[2]

The Editor of the *Manchester Courier* made, in a leading article, the following comment on this incident:

"At that very meeting, *after dinner*, Mr. Cobden was present 'big with speech.' No man ever made a more humiliating or pitiable exhibition of himself. It were charity—lenient indiscriminate charity—to assume that the man who could discover the impious audacity to deny the civilising influence of Christianity, was in that befooled, variable and reckless mood which would euqally prompt him to break his neighbour's head, or kiss the dust of his feet, rather than that he acted from the natural impulse of his heart. Better far be looked upon as the prince of idiots than as a professor and propagator of infidelity."

The insinuation that one so abstemious as Cobden was under the influence of liquor is sufficiently grotesque, and was passed over in silence by Cobden, but he replied to the editor of the *Manchester Chronicle*, who charged him with making a contumelious sneer at Christianity:

"Now, sir," wrote Cobden, "I ask you, who are not an ignorant or illiterate person, but a man of education, and therefore able, however unwillingly, to answer the question, I ask whether civilisation and Christianity be one and the same thing? If so, by what name will you describe the state of society in ancient Greece and Rome? They were not Christian countries, but were they not civilised? Did not Demosthenes and Cicero find civilised audiences to applaud those models of eloquence which modern orators endeavour in vain to imitate? Think you that Phidias created his masterpieces of art for the gratification of *savages* in Athens? Again, sir, I ask whether you will maintain that civilisation and Christianity are words of identical meaning? And if not I call upon you to disavow the dishonest (for I cannot call you ignorant) attempt to confound the one word with the other merely to found on it a gratuitous charge of sneering at religion."[3]

---

[1] *Manchester Guardian*, Nov. 4, 1840.
[2] *Ibid.*, Nov. 7, 1840.
[3] *Manchester Chronicle*, Oct. 31, 1840.

The meeting would perhaps have been wiser to have listened with calmness to Cobden's criticisms. The Niger expedition was a failure, and forty-one out of the 301 persons of whom it was composed perished of fever. It was a bitter disappointment to Buxton, but the society had to be dissolved in January 1843.

WILLIAM E. A. AXON.

LANDLORDISM AND THE HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES.

"COMPARATIVELY few out of tens of thousands of women in London earn more than nine shillings a week, and *half their earnings filter into the pockets of the landlords.*" So states Mr. Thomas Holmes, former police-court missionary, recently interviewed. In the words italicised lies the solution of the whole housing question.

What is a room? It is a volume or expanse *of* room, of extension in three directions, that is to say, enclosed in an envelope of brick, wood, and other material. The cost of the room is what the material-envelope of it costs; which envelope is a manufactured article, the outcome of capital and labour. And the room is the envelope plus the space within it.

Suppose a number of rooms grouped together, in other words, a house, newly built, and that a woman such as above referred to, typical of the working classes, takes one of the rooms in it, paying the landlord four shillings and sixpence a week. She occupies the room say twenty years. In that period she pays the cost of the room, and more than pays its cost, but is the room hers? Not a nail in one of the floor-boards is hers. How is this? Why is not the room hers? In the case of any other manufactured article, when once the cost has been paid either in lump sum or by arranged instalments, property in the article passes from the payee to the payer. How is it that alone in the case of articles room or house, the manufacturer of the article, the landlord call him, continuously demands payment for his property, continuously receives payment for his property, and continuously—keeps the property?

A railway-station comes into existence near by the house, more people seek residence in its neighbourhood, and the value of rooms in it becomes greater. But it is not the room-structure, the manufactured article, that has increased in value. On the contrary, this has lessened in value, for it has had twenty years wear. And as the room is but structure and space-within, it is evident that what has increased in value is—the space-within. But this in no way concerns the landlord, surely. It is the room-structure that is his property, not the space-within. Consider for a moment what the meaning of it would be if the space-within as well as the

room-structure were the landlord's property. The quotations adduced are from Sir Robert Ball's "Story of the Heavens."

This world of ours, with all that in it is, moves ever on through space. If localised, so to speak, at any one instant, localised in thought, that is, then, one second later, by its orbital motion, it is positioned in space some "eighteen miles" from where the thought had localised it one second earlier. "The velocity of the express train is not even the thousandth part of the velocity of the earth." And if the space within a room were the landlord's property, this would mean that the whole track of space through which the room-structure had passed during that one second was also the landlord's property; for the reason that unless the space within the room was the landlord's property all the time, it could not be his property at any moment of the time. And so from second to second, from hour to hour, from week to week, from year to year. And thus the whole orbit of space through which the room-structure passed in one year, an orbit of "583,000,000 miles," would be the property of the landlord. Nor is this all. For besides the motion of the earth in its orbit as part of the solar system, the system itself, "quicker than the swiftest rifle-bullet that was ever fired," is rushing perpetually onward. The track of the room-structure is thus by (1) the rotation of the earth on its axis, (2) the revolution of the earth round the sun, and (3) the onward sweep of the whole solar system—made intricate and incalculable. Yet all this track would be the property of the landlord. And as the movement of the system, which itself is "merely a little island group in the universe," from age to age goes pauselessly on, a claim on the part of the landlord to the space-within of the bricks-and-mortar envelope of any one room, would mean that the landlord of any, the smallest, room anywhere, was seised essentially of the whole universe of space. For in order that the landlord shall be seised of the space-within that fragment of a particle of the island group, a room-structure, anywhere, he must be seised of it everywhere, must be seised of it wherever in the universe vacuity the room-structure travels. And this not for a day only, but for as long as the room-structure endured.

Manifestly then it is only the structure of a room that is a landlord's property. Nor would the landlord himself say otherwise. And the discovery has still to be made of how it is that for as long as a room-structure holds together, say for two hundred years or more, its successive tenants are always paying for it, and yet that it is never paid for. Say that I am a printer, and that I can make use in my business of a machine that is in the market, a machine costing the same as was the cost of the above room-structure. It does not suit me, however, to buy the machine right out, nor even to purchase it by instalments, and I therefore propose to the manufacturer to *rent*

it of him, paying him so much per week. He consents; it is the course that will be most to his profit, and the contract is perfectly free on both sides. The proposal was mine, and it is I who am master of the situation, and such terms could not be forced upon me by the manufacturer. For if I desired to purchase one of his machines, and he refused it me except for a perpetual payment, then I say to him: "No, I have beforetime done without a machine, had to do without it when there was no machine, and I can do so still."

The matter is altogether different, however, as to a room. The woman who has paid four shillings and sixpence a week for twenty years for a room must go on paying. There is no freedom of contract here. The woman cannot say: "I can do without a room," and it is the landlord who is master of the situation. Space to BE in the woman must have; it is the first necessity of her life, as it is of all our lives. And if the landlord says: "This manufactured article, room-structure, is mine, my terms for it are the payment of a perpetual rental, and only on my terms shall you have access to the space within it,"—the would-be tenant must of very necessity accept the terms.

But what other are such terms on the part of a landlord than making this "space-within" his property? Property is the generic term for all that a person has dominion over, and as by the terms that he insists upon the landlord has dominion over the unobstructed space within a room-envelope, the space-within is his property. The matter is of the housing of the working classes, the classes who live, live as families, move, and have their being in one, two or three rooms; whose rooms are their homes, the start-points of their life-energies. And the landlord, having dominion over the home, holds the working classes in the hollow of his hand. In the every day barter for livelihood, a man renders his fellow man service for service; what service does the landlord render? The service he renders to his fellow men is to make them, for the whole of their lives, pay *him* for, so to call it, the "elbow-room," without which they cannot live, to fine them for existing, that is. The words, "This is my house, these are my rooms," on the part of a landlord, do no more than euphemistically veil the fact that what he really says is, "This is my space." The increase in space-value by the propinquity of a railway-station has been referred to; appropriating space, the landlord appropriates this increase. And as further increases in value come to the space, he appropriates them all.

As soon as the railway-station is established, the weekly rent of the woman-worker is raised to five shillings. In a few years further "improvements" come about, and the working classes are "improved" out of the neighbourhood. The strain upon the workers' lives is intensified. The landlords in the station neighbourhood

tranquilly gather-in to themselves the increases of space-value as they accrue, by raising their tenants' rents. This is, in part, what practically the landlords' appropriation of space amounts to. Hume says that "the interest and happiness of human society is the ultimate point by which what is a man's property must be determined." Space being of man's life the first necessity, last of all should it come within the power of an individual fellow man. Within the landlord's power, however, it comes, not last of all, but first of all. And the poor woman, unable to keep up the payment of five shillings a week for the room that is in equity hers, gets a week's notice to quit. This is, in some further part, what the landlord's dominion signifies. Is it to the interest and happiness of human society that space should be landlord's property?

To the working-classes it is he who "lords" it over the house who is "landlord," whether he be householder, house-owner, or house-farmer; so indubitably indeed, that for the actual "land"-lord, the special term of "ground-land"-lord is coined. The "ground-land"-lord is not now in question, but it is in point to notice that this landlord, speaking straight out and making law of it, says: "Whatever you attach to my freehold belongs to my freehold, that is, to me." And *his* property is material substance. The "house-land"-lord is discreetly silent as to what is his property, and *he* quietly appropriates *inexistence*. And, safeguarding his property by means of menacing, but, as to what is really his, vigilantly indefinite laws, he makes of space his Tom Tiddler's ground. The man of thought is awed by the majesty of Nature. Pascal says: "The eternal silence of this infinitude of space terrifies me." So also Herbert Spencer. But the landlord is ignorant of awe. He says to every new-born babe: "By me and my fellow landlords the space of the universe is monopolised, and one or other of us you will the whole of your life have to pay for space to BE in."

To carry the case of the woman one step further. She owes several weeks rent. Instead of having given her notice to quit, the landlord could have distrained on her few goods (for such are the laws that the landlords have made for themselves); she is in fact beholden to him for his forbearance. She tries to get a room elsewhere, but her rent-book is in arrear, and the landlords to whom she applies refuse to accept her as a tenant. Monopolising space, they are the arbiters of who shall have abiding place in it, and the applicants to them for "permission to live," for this is what application for a room amounts to, are sorted out according to their ability to pay for the permission. With the notice to quit hanging over her head, and earning nothing whilst seeking a room, the woman-worker has to sell her few belongings for subsistence, and she drifts into the workhouse. That she shall so drift is the

sentence that has been pronounced upon her. As she cannot pay the landlord's price of BEING, she but cumbereth the ground.

In perhaps most instances the landlord thinks only of self-advantage, and the tenant, though conscious that things are somewhere wrong, is too engrossed with the cares of livelihood to think the matter out. What most of all the working classes want is relief from that burthen of all burthens on their weekly wage—the rent burthen. It is the working classes who experience the terrible reality of the landlord's claim to space. What the claim means scientifically has been set forth. Were it not that the claim is no mockery, but lies behind the demand of rent for any and every the smallest room, the pretension of claim would be farcical. From the point of view of its arrogance, it is not within the power of words to lay bare the awfulness of the pretension. When the working classes refuse to recognise that the condition of Nature, which we call space, can be property, to be let, sub-let, and sold by one man to another, then very quickly will the housing question be brought to a satisfactory issue. It is the working classes' question, and it is for them to work out their own salvation. And it concerns the working-class women specially, for it is the question of "home." Already the workers ask themselves if to everlastingly pay rent for a material structure which never becomes theirs is the purpose of their existence, and discern that when the cost of the envelope of a room is once repaid, the payment after that of rent for the room is simply a payment for the space within. This important truth once fully grasped, the working classes will refuse to deal for the structure of room or house on other than manufactured-article terms, and will bargain for walls and floors and ceilings as for other articles of manufacture—in free contract. In the two above-stated refusals is contained the scientific solution of the housing question. And there is no other solution.

Henry W. Ley.

THE PROPER SPHERE FOR SPORT.

It has often been held that our characteristic addiction to manly sport and outdoor games of all kinds accounts for much of our success as a nation. We all remember Wellington's famous pronouncement that the battle of Waterloo was won on the battlefields of Eton. So far at least as concerns the pluck, stamina, readiness of resource, and general competence of our officers, their early training in cricket, football, rowing, boxing, &c., does probably account for a good deal in our military and naval achievements. More than this it would be rash to maintain; and it is open to question whether the time spent in subsequent years over hunting, polo, and shooting might not, in some instances, be more profitably devoted.

Down to a comparatively few years ago many of us were rather inclined still—in spite of the lessons of the Franco-German war—to look down upon our Continental neighbours because they did not (to any extent worth reckoning) play our games or practise the noble art of self-defence in our own particular fashion. "Savate" was despised as low, and "jiu-jitsu" was then as unknown as most of the other institutions of Japan. Nowadays this wholesale depreciation of foreigners as "no sportsmen," &c. &c., is less in favour. The reasons for this healthy change in our attitude, this greater readiness to take lessons from other nations even in matters affecting our own personal habits and the training of our children, are too numerous to deal with here: two only must be referred to. The first is that the justification for an attitude of national superiority, even on the field, the asphalte, and the river grows conspicuously smaller every year. The French, Germans, Hungarians, and other Continentals, not to speak of our American and Colonial kinsfolk, have been gradually taking to "sport" in all its branches almost as ardently as we have; so much so that international athletic contests of different kinds have become quite everyday events.

Still more, however, is the change due to the fact that we have been compelled, for various reasons, to view with some concern the "condition of the people" question at home, and to face boldly the problem of how to arrest degeneration and raise the present standard of national efficiency. In going to the roots of this questien, we

have been compelled to acknowledge that the systematic and more wholesale cultivation of military, gymnastic, and technical training among most foreign nations—very notably in Germany, Switzerland, and Japan, but largely in the Latin countries also—as well as the greater attention bestowed of late by the "paternal" governments of these States to the whole physical welfare of the masses and to their education, both general and technical, have produced, in less than the course of two generations, some very remarkable results in the way of improved national efficiency. Here, in our country, thanks to the healthy outdoor life and field sports in which most members of the upper and the wealthy middle-classes are able to indulge frequently—having also grown up under that good old public school training, which is hard to beat anywhere in the world—we can show some fine human fruit at the *top* of our national basket. But underneath there is a weltering mass of rubbish, which has been grown under very different conditions.

The results of wisely-directed "paternalism," as above indicated, in the fields of trade and industry, no less than in that of military self-defence, are rightly held by many observers to be of vital importance for British statesmen, and the intelligent public at large, to study and turn to account. From a national and patriotic standpoint, they must, doubtless, be admitted to rank higher than the well known healthful influence—so far as it goes—of merely spontaneous or school ordained sports. There is, accordingly, very little fear now of that "other side" of the physical culture question—its relation to national training and national efficiency—being any longer neglected. The nation is becoming wide awake to the importance of State directed, or at any rate State promoted, physical culture. The danger now is rather on the other side. It is quite conceivable that, while taking useful lessons from the Continent and Japan in some of the most practical applications of bureaucratic paternalism we may neglect the further development and extension among the masses, of those more essentially English accomplishments in which the nation has been wont to pride itself. We may thus throw away one of our greatest existing vantage grounds through a too feverish anxiety to adopt the "latest fashions" in international progress.

The fact is that, rationally treated, *i.e.*, as means of health, power and character building—"improvement of the breed," in fine—rather than as stepping-stones to a "brilliant athletic career," our sports and defensive arts may be regarded as the salt of the nation's physical life. They are that which helps to preserve it from decadence more, perhaps, than anything else which is specially characteristic of our people. The problem now is how to render available for the whole population—the town denizens more parti-

cularly—the advantages in these respects from which they are at present, so many of them, practically excluded. These should be the inalienable birthright of every Briton, and not of the more fortunate classes only. It is this national or educational, as well as truly and literally *re-creational*, aspect of sports to which more attention may with profit be devoted than is being at present. It is the best *foundation* upon which an effective system of national military, as well as technical, training can be built up.

Let us now consider the present position of games and sports—of all, at any rate, that involve physical exercise, in the open air or otherwise. With the notable exception of horse-racing and a few others we thus cover the whole field of legitimate "sport." The turf, except for the jockeys and the horses themselves, is not a pastime that involves much exercise, unless it be for eyes, brains, and vocal organs!

We will start with the young generation. It cannot be seriously questioned that outdoor games in moderation are highly desirable for a boy's health and muscular development. Games, moreover, afford the very best moral training. They inculcate self-control and confidence, courage, generosity, unselfishness, quickness of decision, good temper, comradeship and *esprit de corps*—alike in the event of defeat or victory. Then, again, there can be little doubt that outdoor games of a vigorous type are the healthiest form of recreation for those to grow accustomed to who will be compelled to lead a more or less sedentary life; just as it is equally true that for those whose work is of a strictly active (bodily) character more or less sedentary recreation is the most suitable, and even these benefit from a change of exercise. Turning, then, to the school aspect of the subject. In my opinion, just as the institution of compulsory games was a move for the good, so similarly it should be instilled in the young idea that to allow sport of any kind to "run riot" in one's mind is distinctly bad; in other words, a moral balance should be pointed to in the matter of games as in everything else; in fact, a lad should be educated up to the idea of "playing to live, not living to play." The importance of this being impressed on the mind whilst still impressionable can scarcely be exaggerated. The writer has constantly pleaded for more "plain talk" in our public schools. House-masters (and also fathers) might with advantage act more in the capacity of elder brothers to the boys under their charge than anything else. It is to be feared, however, that there are many house-masters who are but little in touch with their boys, the said boys being too much *afraid* of them to regard them with true affection and respect. Many have lately dwelt on the close connection between a taste for too much play and the young assistant-master of athletic fame. It would not, however, do

to assume as a matter of course that assistant-masters who have done well at games cannot also make excellent teachers. On the contrary it may be contended that a master who is good at games is more likely to command esteem without fear—to win the hearts of boys in fact—than one who has achieved great distinction in classics or mathematics; and the former—if he knows enough, but not too much—is more likely to prove a useful teacher than the latter. In view of the difficulty which all young men without private means have, in the present day, of finding their way into any profession or business of a suitable description, it is scarcely surprising that so many should seek to become schoolmasters, thereby qualifying for a healthy existence, morally and physically.

From the national education point of view, what I may call the "bracing" social aspect of school games is perhaps the strongest argument in favour of encouraging their universal employment as part of the regular curriculum for boys, and even (as is now becoming so usual) for girls also. They generate enthusiasm for doing the best for your own party and the habit of concerted activity. From these juvenile sports the youth of the country, like that of ancient Greece, is led on naturally to the patriotic pursuits of military exercises. Let us here touch on a side issue in connection with the subject of national defence. Were the Government to support Lord Roberts by taking the initiative in the matter of universal military training by establishing ranges with ammunition and rifles in various parts of the country, it seems possible that they might, in so doing, also tend to alleviate in some measure the "unemployed" problem. The spirit of competition as between schools and colleges, and "old boys" from the same, would be a livening element to the Volunteer service, rifle shooting, &c., as in games. The hat would be sent round for the less fortunate but still "stalwart" comrades. This would entice many that have not been so far enticed on purely patriotic grounds.

As a preparation for national defence, games are only a degree less essential than drill, the details of which are constantly changing; and as a preparation for regimental life they are invaluable, partly on account of the lesson in comradeship.

The question of the use and abuse of sport has been discussed in the press so fully of late that it may seem wearisome to some readers to say much more about it, but a few words upon it at this point in our present subject would appear to be appropriate. Over-indulgence in sport, at the expense of our regular duties in life—to ourselves, to our belongings, to our country—is just as bad as too much of any other good thing, and there can be little doubt that what has been termed the "idolatry of sport" is a rapidly growing factor in this country at the present moment. It must

be remembered, too, that the time indulged in over sport is not only in the performance itself and in getting to the scene of action but in the absorbing thought devoted to the subject by some. As a writer in the *Standard* ("F. R. S.") has truly noted:

"the history of civilisation shows that a great access of wealth and ease leads to an abnormal growth of amusements, which become a serious object in life, instead of being a recreation to fit men for their work. Let us see to it that we do not come down from our high estate as Rome did in days gone by!"

We are, perhaps, too liable—in these days—to forget the old adage, "You cannot both eat your cake and have it": we are too fond of eating it. For some time we had it all our own way in the majority of the more important trades, and consequently certain weaknesses in our character were of less consequence than they are now. Our trade is undoubtedly suffering in part from the taste for what we may term *swaggerdom*. It can scarcely be disputed that *one* of the explanations of trade going from this country to Germany is the fact that the German trader thinks of little but his business, and that he trains his son on the same lines, whereas a self-made man in this country is still too apt to bring up his son in a way that is quite unsuited for carrying on a trade. The fact of the matter is, that the typical Englishman—from the business point of view of to-day—is generally in too great a hurry, as a rule, to rest on his oars and indulge in a country life before he has made his financial position safe. The typical German trader on the other hand *never* rests on his oars—partly, perhaps, because his mind is solely centred on the success of his business, the result being that he has nothing else to turn to in the closing years of his life. These are, of course, the two extremes, to be equally avoided.

In regard to the English employee, it has, perhaps, been sometimes assumed where it should not be that the "slackers" in work are "slackers" because all their spare time and thought are taken up with sport. As often as not, however, they are real "slackers" in character, and would always be so. Moreover, their connection with sport is at the best limited, as a rule, to *loafing* on sporting grounds, sporting chatter, criticism and betting. Let every large working establishment have a rifle corps and athletic club, and the latter type would be far less prominent in our midst. It must not be forgotten, however, that amongst those who look on at cricket and football matches, &c., are many whose work is of an active bodily description, and whose recreation is necessarily of a sedentary order, besides numerous players of a bygone age who no longer have the time or the activity to play themselves.

It is coming to be more and more recognised, as the various peoples of the world get to know each other better, that in all departments of human progress and human endeavour every nation —nay, every civilised race—has something to learn from the others, and also something to teach them. The culture of individual and national *physique*, the building up of character and efficiency, which may be regarded as the most valuable elements of genuine education (as distinguished from mere bookish instruction and cramming of facts—often more or less useless in after life), form no exception to this rule. Thus it is desirable that Great Britain should now turn to the Continent for new models in some branches of physical and educational progress, particularly in those which have been more successfully dealt with by the State than by private initiative and private societies. It is equally true, however, that she herself is in the best position to create in certain other branches the finest models that the world has ever seen. She has the necessary *nucleus* ready to hand, the experience, the traditions, and the human material wherewith to leaven the mass. No country in the world contains a finer assortment of athletic and well-developed men and women in its midst; we are not, of course, dealing with the *average* British type, which may be—almost certainly is—inferior to that of some other white nationalities. This picked class, or *nucleus*, should be utilised as the teachers and organisers of a national system of games and sports, in which might in time be incorporated the whole of the rising generation of Britons and Irishmen.

If Christianity has any meaning for them, our privileged and "comfortable" classes are the natural guardians of their less fortunate countrymen. Let these classes once become conscious of this power and this duty, let them grow unanimous and enthusiastic about the immense benefits such an organisation would confer upon the country—counteracting, as it would, by natural and pleasant means the less desirable tendencies regarding which so much has been said and written of late. It is by the propagation and organisation of the good, and not by the attempted suppression of the evil, that all lasting progress is made. There is not a doubt, if once these natural guardians put their shoulders to the wheel, that the whole thing can be done by voluntary effort and support, and without any considerable recourse to compulsory legislation. The former has always been our English way of carrying out great social movements, and the present scheme is one that we can probably conduct better, and with less opposition, on these lines. Financially it should be comparatively cheap to engineer—as philanthropic and similar enterprises go.

Meanwhile, our Samurai, our old public schoolboys, 'Varsity, army, and navy men, of healthy stock, and of the good old British

traditions, might at least do something towards putting a break upon certain commercialistic tendencies which are corrupting the wholesome and honourable habits of their class. Something like an incorporated order is now required, to set a public example of clean living and thinking, a sane and healthy life generally, free from the feverish social ambitions and still more sordid indulgences of the so-called "smart set." With these they should have no dealings—what business have *they*, indeed, "in *that* galley?"

CHARLES BRIGHT.

RUSSIA AND THE UNITED KINGDOM.

II.

As shown in the first of these articles, the famous Emancipation Act of February 19, 1861, set free the serfs of the Russian nobility, and settled their economic conditions. The picture of their moral, intellectual, and social condition, prior to emancipation, is wonderfully suggested, rather than directly painted, by the "Russian grandmother" of the previous article. But that edict only set free from personal servitude the former serfs of the nobility, and was followed in 1866 by a second Act, which settled the condition of the former *State* peasants. It cannot be denied that these two measures were by far the greatest experiments in agrarian legislation which the world has yet seen; the agricultural class affected by them constituting, ten years ago, when the heart-rending book of Mr. Stepniak was originally published,[1] eighty-two per cent. of the entire population, numbering in European Russia, excluding Finland and Poland, about sixty-three millions. The *moujiks*, or tillers of the soil, are therefore necessarily the chief figures of Russian social and political life. They bear the public burdens, they supply the military force, and their ideas and aspirations must of necessity play the principal part in the future development of Russia.

Most of us have been interested in the accounts of "the self-governing, semi-republican *mir*, and the somewhat communistic Russian system of land tenure, with its periodical equalisations and divisions," and almost all thoughtful persons living in the early sixties expected great moral, economic, and social results from the agrarian arrangements of 1861 and 1866. But, as pointed out by Mr. Stepniak,

"Emancipation has utterly failed to realise the ardent expectations of its advocates and promoters. The great benefit of the measure was purely moral. It has failed to improve the material condition of the former serfs, who, on the whole, are worse off than they were before the Emancipation. The bulk of our peasantry is in a condition not far removed from actual starvation—a fact which can neither be denied nor concealed even by the official Press.

"The frightful and continually increasing misery of the toiling millions of our country is the most terrible count in the indictment against the Russian Government, and the paramount cause and justification of the

[1] *The Russian Peasantry.* By Stepniak. London: George Routledge & Sons.

rebellion against it. It would be a gross injustice to affirm that the Government has directly ruined or purposely injured the peasantry. Why should it act with such foolish and wanton wickedness? We can well understand that a despotic Government, caring only for its own selfish interests, should object to the community being educated. But it is to the Government's own material advantage to have well-to-do taxpayers rather than the beggarly ones it has now. I admit willingly that the central Government quite sincerely intended to benefit the peasants, not only morally, but economically, by the agrarian arrangement of 1861, and still more so by that of 1866."

He further tells us:

"Since the Emancipation the yield from the direct taxes imposed on the peasants has increased. But until 1879 their burdens had increased 12 per cent. only. Since that time they have remained stationary, and of late years there is even a slight decrease in the direct taxes—very slight, yet still a decrease. As to the impoverishment of the masses, measured by the reduced consumption of food and the increase in the rate of mortality, it is frightful and intense, and shows no sigus of abatement whatever. This is proof to demonstration that there must be at work another corrosive influence more inexorable and fatal and less under control even than the actions of the uncontrollable bureaucracy.

"This influence lies in the new economical system, quite opposed to the traditions and ideals of the Russian peasantry, and which has been forced on them by the Act of Emancipation."

Mr. Stepniak further notes that:

"The Russian popular conceptions of land tenure, though they may seem somewhat heterodox to a Western lawyer or modern economist, are exactly the same as those which in past times prevailed among all European nations before they happened to fall victims to somebody's conquest. Russian peasants hold that land, being an article of universal need, made by nobody, ought not to become property in the usual sense of the word. It naturally belongs to, or, more exactly, it should remain in the undisturbed possession of, those by whom, for the time being, it is cultivated. If the husbandman discontinues the cultivation of his holding he has no more right over it than the fisher over the sea where he has fished, or the shepherd over the meadow where he has once pastured his flock.

"This does not, however, imply any question as to the right of the worker over the product of his labour. In Russia a peasant who has improved and brought under tillage new land always obtains from the *mir* a right of undisturbed possession for a number of years, varying in its *maximum* in divers provinces from twelve to forty years, but strictly conforming in each case to the amount of labour which has been bestowed on it by the peasant and his family. During this period the occupier possesses the full right of alienating his holding by gift or sale. But when the husbandman is supposed to have been fully remunerated for his work all personal prescriptive right ceases."

These notions are not exclusively Russian, but deeply rooted amongst all the Slavonic races, and were moreover common to all classes in Russia until in Peter the Great's time it came into close alliance with Western nations, and, as stated by Prince Wassiltchikoff:

"The right of use of possession of the occupation of land has, on the contrary, been very clearly and firmly understood and determined from time immemorial. The very word 'property,' as applied to land, hardly existed in ancient Russia. No equivalent to this neologism is to be found in old archives, charters, or patents. On the other hand, we meet at every step with rights acquired by use or occupation, The land is recognised as being the natural possession of the husbandman, the fisher, or the hunter, of him who 'sits upon it.'"

Moreover, as Mr. Stepniak further tells us:

"The expression 'our land' in the mouth of a peasant includes indiscriminately the whole land he occupies for the time being, the land which is his private property (under recent legislation), the land held in common by the village (which is, therefore, only in the temporary possession of each household), and also the land rented by the village from neighbouring landlords. Here we see once more the fact of working the land identified with the rights of ownership.

"When serfdom was introduced, and one-half of the arable land, with the twenty-three millions of human beings who lived thereon, gradually became the property of the nobility, the newly enslaved peasants found less difficulty in realising the fact of their slavery than in understanding the law which allotted the land to those by whom it was not tilled. 'We are yours,' they said to their masters, 'but the land is ours.' '*My vashi, zemlia nasha*'—this stereotyped, hundred times quoted phrase, vividly sums up the Russian peasant's conception of serfdom."

When the day of emancipation came the serfs fully expected that they would have all the land which they had previously tilled, and that the Czar would keep the nobles "on salary" as he kept his generals, and indeed the buying out of the landlords by the State was suggested as the most convenient solution of the problem. The land was, however, so parsimoniously distributed that the peasants could no longer supply themselves thereby with the barest necessities of life, but were driven, by hard necessity, to seek other and outside paid labour; whilst the estates of their previous owners continued so vast that the landlords could not find regular paid labourers to till them, outside the ranks of the ex-serfs.

In the second chapter of his book, Mr. Stepniak fully explains the mechanism whereby capitalism has seized the absolute control of the resources of Russia, by means of the railways and credit, the State—that is, the Imperial administration—acting the part of the *deus ex machina* of the capitalists and of the despoilers of the people. Any one who carefully studies that chapter and the three following ones will readily understand how it has come about that whilst the ordinary Russian peasant household has to give up, year by year, in taxes, forty-five per cent. of its whole income (including all outside paid industrial labour), starvation has become their chronic condition, and how whilst the United Kingdom imported from Russia last year 24,703,000 cwts. of wheat, the Russian peasant, who grew that wheat, can now no longer afford the wheat flour they formerly used as the food of their young children, and

their own holiday luxury, but must feed on rye, which now also is becoming an article of large exportation, as well as the oats which they need as the food of their faithful agricultural helper, the horse. The bulk of the peasants live in a state of chronic semi-starvation, whilst in strictly agricultural provinces the rate of mortality has frightfully increased. Nor will the readiness of wealthy English business firms to establish factories in Russia be in any way surprising, seeing they batten and fatten on this misery. Yet not for ever shall these things be. Not for ever will the English worker be content that his Russian brother shall starve that he may be supplied with foreign-grown food, while countless English acres remain uncultivated, and English workers perish for lack of employment. Not for ever will the Russian peasant remain the prey of the foreign capitalist and of an ignorant despotism. The day is at the dawn. The growing solidarity of international sympathies and interests, especially those of the workers and the thinkers, assures the freedom and progress of the future, whilst in Russia itself the rapidly developing intelligence of the long oppressed peasantry, and its growing power of organisation, is one of the greatest marvels of the time. How this intelligence has been developed and sustained may be learned from the later chapters of this profoundly interesting book, setting forth clearly as they do the conditions of the lives of the peasantry, their religious ideas, the organisation of the *mirs*, the oppressions of officialism and of usury from which they suffer, and the long drawn out tragedy of Russian history, and the grounds of hope for the future. Not even the fickle feebleness of the present representative of the Tsardom can long keep in doubt the ultimate issues of this great moral uprising, in which men and women stand side by side, demanding equal freedom and equal justice for all classes within the Russian empire, and for *both sexes*. It seems indeed possible, and even probable, that the women of Russia, as those of Finland have been, will be fully enfranchised, and fully profiting by their enfranchisement before a Liberal Ministry, false to its pretensions of love of freedom and justice, can resolve to assure political justice to the mothers of this nation. The Prime Minister, on May 19 last, assured those of us who waited upon him to ask for our immediate enfranchisement, that the justice of our claim was indisputable. The House of Commons contains 407 members pledged to woman's suffrage, of whom 282 are supporters of the present Liberal Ministry. And yet the House of Commons, which is now taking thirteen weeks' holiday, has done nothing whatever so far this year to speed forward this measure of justice, whilst as Ministers have appropriated the whole of the autumn Session for Government business, nothing whatever is to be hoped from these later sittings, unless women bestir themselves to make their immediate enfranchisement a question of life and death

to the existing Ministry. The temporary services of Mr. Asquith, Mr. Bryce, Lord Crewe, and the other opponents of women's suffrage within the Cabinet, are less vital to the well-being of this nation than is the establishment of justice between the sexes, and the equality before the law of man and woman.

If women show themselves in earnest now, we shall speedily see the end of our long and cruelly disheartening struggle, so painfully sustained for forty years. If they now show themselves lacking in energy, or unable to realise that the claims of human justice are incomparably higher and nobler than those of party devotion, they will reap as they sow, in increasing political and social degradation. The speeches of Mr. John Burns and the "Dangerous Performances Bill," introduced by the Home Office a few weeks ago, have shown with what levity the existing Ministry is prepared to treat the interests of women, who are despised because they have no voting power. And reckless would-be reformers of social abuses are ever ready to treat the interests of women as mere *corpora vilia*, to be sacrificed to their crude experiments. A significant illustration of this tendency is furnished by Fabian Tract No. 128, just published: "The Case for a Legal Minimum Wage,"—in which the Fabians, far from claiming justice by the assurance on lines of justice of "equal pay for equal work" —propose the legal enforcement of different rates of pay for men and women, under the plea that the minimum wage for a man, whether married or single, should provide the "food and clothing necessary for the healthy subsistence of an average family, reckoned as consisting of a man, his wife, and three children," whilst the minimum wage for a woman should "provide for the maintenance of an adult woman living by herself."

They quote with admiration and approval in support of their principle the example of the Australian colony of Victoria, where such differentiated rates of pay for the two sexes have for some years been legally enforced. To show how this works out practically I have compiled the following statement of the average weekly wages paid in several trades in Victoria in 1902 to men and women of over twenty years of age, the figures being taken from pp. 505–6 of the official "Statistical Account of Australia and New Zealand, 1903–4":

Class of Trade.	Weekly Wage. Men. £	s.	d.	Women. £	s.	d.
Boots and shoes	2	3	5	1	1	0
Bread, biscuits, &c.	2	5	7		14	9
Brushes, brooms, &c.	1	19	2		15	5
Clothing	2	6	9	1	1	9
Furniture	2	8	7	1	1	6
Printing, &c.	2	13	8		15	8
Shirt-making	2	0	0		16	1
Woollen manufacture	1	19	1	1	3	4

Against the principle of a minimum wage I have nothing whatever to say—the deliberate "sweating" of labour is one of the cruellest features of our present industrial system, and needs the forcible restraint of just law; but this differential treatment, this legal enforcement of the inferior industrial status of every woman, is a different matter altogether. Our Fabian friends say:

"The necessity for fixing a lower wage for women than for men raises one of the greatest difficulties in the way of an equitable solution of the problem; and it must be said at once that it is a difficulty which cannot be fairly adjusted without bringing the Poor Law to the aid of the minimum wage.

"The reason for paying men more highly than women is that under our marriage institutions the man is the woman's paymaster for her domestic work. This domestic work, including childbearing and the rearing of children, is onerous, dangerous, and absolutely indispensable to society. But the woman is not directly paid for it; she is given, instead, a legal claim on her husband's means, name, and status. Therefore it is admitted that the man, having to support another adult and their children, must receive a wage sufficient to maintain those several persons, whilst the woman is regarded industrially as a single woman, needing only enough to support herself.

"The objections to such an arrangement are obvious. Some men are not married, and are therefore receiving family wages for single life. What is far worse, some women are widows with children; and these women are receiving the wages of a single adult, and starving a family on it.

"To novices in political science it may seem simple to establish two wages, one to be paid to married and the other to single workers. But in competitive commerce such solutions are Utopian. If married men cost more in the labour market than single ones, employers would never employ a married man where a single one was available; and the married men would thus tend to be driven out of the market by the single ones. The same would be true of women. Further, if men and women were paid at the same rates, men would always be employed in preference to women wherever possible, because, fairly or unfairly, male labour is considered industrially superior to female. The demand for 'equal wages for men and women' is perfectly well known to trade-unionists as a device for keeping women out of men's trades. Any attempt to maintain two prices in the labour market for the same article, or to maintain the same price for two different qualities of the same article, must fail, because nobody will buy at the higher price when he can get what he wants at the lower, and nobody will take second quality when he can get first quality for the same money. Therefore, whilst the present competitive system of employment by competing private enterprises prevails, the industrial minimum wage must conform to three conditions: (*a*) *It must be lower for women than for men;* (*b*) all men must have the same minimum wage, and all women the same minimum wage; (*c*) the man's wage must be enough to support a family, and the woman's to support a single independent adult.

"This leaves the problem of the bachelor and the widow with children unsolved, just as they are left unsolved by the present system.

"The case of the bachelor may be disregarded for two reasons: (*a*) if the minimum wage secures enough to the married man, it is no evil, *but only a negligible inequity to let the bachelor have a little more than enough;* (*b*) the practice of working men at present shows that, as a matter of fact,

they do not find that they can provide themselves with domestic service and companionship more cheaply as bachelors than by marriage."

But is it a "negligible inequity" that the bachelor should receive so much more than the single woman? Is it not a mischievous education of him into the belief (too strong in most men already) that as a human creature he is of far greater value than a mere woman?

And how do our Fabian friends propose to assure that a man thus trained before marriage to a vain conceit of himself, and too probably to a mischievous self-indulgence, will after marriage duly subordinate that self-indulgence to the interests of his wife and children? How do they propose to assure that he will hand over to the wife the money whereby she can purchase the family necessaries? The fact that English law provides for the wife no satisfactory means of enforcing this claim is one for which the present writer has striven in vain for nearly forty years to secure an adequate legal remedy. The latest legislation on this subject, the Summary Jurisdiction Act of 1895, amended the previously existing law by providing that any married woman whose husband has been guilty of such persistent cruelty to her, *or of such wilful neglect to provide reasonable maintenance for her, or her infant children whom he is legally bound to maintain, as to cause her to leave and live apart from him*, may apply to a court of summary jurisdiction for an order providing: (*a*) That she shall be no longer bound to live with her husband; (*b*) That she shall have the legal custody of the children under sixteen years of age; (*c*) That a sum of money not exceeding £2 weekly shall be paid by the husband, either to her personally, or to an officer of the court for her use.

These provisions apply also to the case of a woman whose husband has been summarily convicted of aggravated assault upon her, or who has deserted her—the only cases contemplated by the previously existing law—and also to the case of a wife whose husband has been convicted upon indictment of an assault upon her, and sentenced to pay a fine of more than five pounds, or of more than two months' imprisonment. So far these are ameliorations of the previous law, and will relieve many unhappy wives; but the measure is vitiated by three serious defects:

(1) The wife's relief is absolutely at the discretion of male magistrates only, who may refuse the sorely needed relief asked for, and thus drive the wife back within the power of an exasperated tyrant.

(2) In the new classes of cases contemplated by the Act, when the husband neglects to contribute to the maintenance of the wife and children, or treats the wife with persistent cruelty—the wife must have left the home because of this neglect or ill-treatment before she can apply for relief under the Act. In a multitude of

cases this provision puts an effectual bar to the relief desired by the sufferer, the more so as many magistrates are administering the new Act on the old lines, refusing the relief asked for, and telling applicant wives (in direct contravention of the express words of the Act), that the violence complained of must be of such a character as to bring the husband under the Aggravated Assaults Act before relief could be granted. And even when the relief has been granted, the position of the separated wife is a very cruel one, for, be it remembered, this poor woman is not free to marry, and the Act expressly provides for the discharge of the order obtained by the wife on proof of an act of adultery on her part.

What is absolutely necessary is such an amendment of the law as shall enable a wife, whilst living with her husband, to enforce his presumed legal obligation to contribute to the maintenance of what the law, in every other connection, calls *his* family.

It is a striking comment on what is said above that in 1902, the "separation orders" granted under this Act numbered 7477, a fact which painfully explains the recent enormous increase of these semi-detached couples—free to live apart, but not free to marry again.

It should also be remembered that a very large proportion of unmarried women workers have frequently other relatives more or less dependent on their exertions, an aged father or mother, younger brothers or sisters; yet our Fabian friends would only permit such women to receive wages adequate to the maintenance of a single independent adult. Nor is it easy to see how they will be able to provide for sickness, old age, or out-of-work conditions. Presumably the Fabian view is that the single woman worker can herself provide her own domestic service and companionship.

In the case of the widow with children, the Fabians propose to supplement her minimum wage as a woman by aid from public funds, and free education and free meals for her children.

Would it not be a wiser and juster social economy to seek the transformation of our cruel "competitive system of employment" into a sound and just national social system, in which every human being should be a citizen, with citizen rights, and to every child should be assured its rightful place at the banquet of life?

Far other and larger remedies than those proposed by the Fabians are needed. As the late Miss Zona Vallance affirmed, in a paper not published till after her death:

"If poverty and mischievous class distinctions are to be abolished, democratic reform of the family life is the most essential of all the steps. Equality of opportunity must start within the home. Fair remuneration for social and personal service must start there. Fair opportunity to

develop various natural gifts in service of the common weal must start there. For it is only after the home-maker *par excellence*, who necessarily is the woman, has become a responsible citizen herself, that she can bear and rear good, efficient, self-respecting citizens, or even insist upon living herself in a decent roomy house with fresh air.

"Multitudes of women are forced to desert all home-making offices because nowhere save in factories or workshops can they secure personal liberty with pay for labour. Some say girls should go into service. Few know that this trade, with its servile associations, and its separation from equals and family, teaches more women than any other to sell their womanhood. Many blame the wife who insists upon securing her pay for herself outside the home; but others point to husbands who, every winter, resort to suicide or crime because they have nothing to give wife or children.

"The husband, driven by need to support the home-worker, has to become proportionately pliable in the employer's hands; and the fiction that the modern family is an economic unit compels him to meet his responsibilities by hours of toil, in some instances almost unlimited, and pay which leaves no margin whatever for old age or for any of life's accidents. Let wage-working men learn that their economic wrongs are bound up with the inferiority of the wife and domestic worker in the eyes of the nation. Husbands are assumed to represent wives in the market as well as in politics; but the one is as much a fiction as the other. The efficiency of the bricklayer is not that of the woman who cooks, washes, mends, markets, and perhaps bears and rears a family; and he never receives her share of the national wealth to hand to her. He receives no more than the bachelor. He receives no more than the market-worth of his own particular skill and labour, not the worth of his wife's.

"Not even the most advanced writer upon economics seems aware of the clear fact that England's economic constitution is reared upon unpaid labours of powerless home-keeping women in precisely the same way as the economic constitution of ancient Greece or Rome was reared upon slave-labour. But it is largely for this reason that the granting of political equality to women is more fundamental as a reform than any of the highly important questions relating to labouring men as a class. *Sex disparity is the key to class disparity.* . . .

"The ancient source of human superiority is that the discriminative personal services and impersonal marketable ones have both been utilised, both been honoured. But there is great danger, now that mechanical invention has qualified mere mechanical workers, as well as meretricious caterers of every sort, to get their individual pay and political power, provided they are men, and has left unrequited and unhonoured the far more intellectual, discriminating, and valuable personal ministries of home-makers and mothers, that many women will feel there is degradation in a personal ministry to husband and children, which excludes from all financial independence as well as from rights to control the laws and take a part in public service.

"If the affections born of personal mutual ministry in the home, if its privacy, its moral discipline, its chances for individuality in taste, are essential to the rich life of human beings, the women who make it must receive recognition of their status from the nation. They themselves, as joint legislators and administrators with men, must be permitted to control that environment into which they are asked to bring fresh human beings."

Until this is done, and men and women, as free and equal citizens, can take counsel together to devise a just remedy for these

evils, and can work together to secure its legal enforcement, it is idle to hope for any real improvement, Men alone can never devise the just remedy. Men alone will never give effect to it. But men and women, free and equal citizens, working together hand in hand, heart with heart, can and will assure that social justice which shall finally perfect itself in that "crowning race of human-kind," for which the world has so long wearily waited.

IGNOTA.

NATIONAL DEFENCE.

III.

IN the July and August numbers of this REVIEW abstracts were given of the various schemes which have been proposed to place the defence of the kingdom on a sounder basis, and also of the proposals of the Right Honourables Arnold Forster and R. B. Haldane, the past and present Secretaries of State for War, for the reorganisation of the British Army.

To the "man in the street" all this discussion about the offensive and defensive strength of our naval and military forces may appear beside the mark. He may say—we have always had an Army and a Navy—at least for the last three hundred years—and one way or another they have managed to accomplish what was required of them. They have kept our coasts clear from invasion, they have conquered or protected a vast Colonial Empire, they have annexed India, and a good share of further India, and they have made our name respected on the continent of Europe whenever we have had occasion to despatch expeditionary forces for foreign wars.

Further, the average Britain says—I am paying £50,000,000 or £60,000,000 (fifty or sixty millions) a year for this assurance on national prosperity, and I think this is more than enough. Within a generation the expenditure on naval and military services has doubled—it was up to the advent of the present Government increasing, and like the royal prerogative in the reign of George III., "it ought to be diminished."

On the other hand, a cry is raised by our most distinguished generals and publicists that the nation is in danger, that our forces are not adequate, or not adequately organised, for the defence of the kingdom and its dependencies, and that some radical change is necessary to place us on a footing of equality with other nations. This view is voiced by Lord Roberts, who, if any one, ought to know whether the army is efficient for the purposes for which it exists, and he has told us plainly that it is not. The other opinions quoted in the two preceding articles referred to are to the same effect, and unless we are to live in a fool's paradise until disaster and ruin overtakes us, it behoves us to bestir ourselves.

The direction in which a remedy is to be sought has been indicated in the previous articles, but in view of the important and

far-reaching results of the scheme authoritatively propounded by Mr. Haldane, and accepted by the Government, it appears desirable to return to his scheme (the outline of which has been already sketched), and to see how far it is practicable, and what would be its effect if carried into practice.

With the contention that very large sums, perhaps excessive sums, are spent on the King's forces, and that they ought, if possible, to be reduced, we have no fault to find. The electors in the last General Election are said to have given a mandate for a reduction, but we opine for a reduction of expenditure all round—not applying exclusively to naval and military more than to other expenditure. It may be said that reductions are more easily effected in naval and military than in other expenditure, as by simply striking off ten thousand men, or by altering the programme of ship-building, a million or two may be saved by a stroke of the pen, as it were; whereas in educational or other expenditure there appear endless intricacies and interdependences from which the former course is free. We have, however, still to learn that the vast electorate of these kingdoms is averse to efficiency in military matters, or to paying the price for efficiency; only they naturally consider that the price they have been required to pay of late is too high; that the same or better results might be attained for a smaller expenditure; and that there has been some bungling somewhere, though not being experts they are not prepared to put their finger on the spot.

Mr. Haldane's scheme, viewed generally, is a scheme for reducing expenditure by the simple expedient of reducing members; and it is doubtful whether, assuming a reduction of numbers to have been necessary, the reduction has been effected in the best directions.

It is in no sense a real reform of our military system, but rather a "series of changes with a view to reducing army estimates," as pointed out by a French staff officer, quoted in the *Standard* of July 18 last. His criticism is so sound that we venture to transcribe it. He says:

"I hold, and most of my countrymen are of the same opinion, that England with her enormous empire, open to attack at many points, her vast responsibilities, and her trading interests of incalculable value, can never have an army sufficient for her possible needs without the right to call on the whole of the manhood of the English race. I do not mean that a conscript army on the French or German model is necessary, but that the youth of the country should be trained compulsorily, and be liable during a certain number of years to be called upon to fill the *cadres* of permanently established units. These *cadres* should be formed of highly trained professional soldiers, officers and non-commissioned officers, equal to say half the full establishment. If you had this skeleton framework of an army with the men to fill it you might reduce the numbers of your regular force to the bare minimum needed for Colonial and Indian garrisons without undue risk, for your Navy would always give you time to mobilise the national guard.

"I say you might reduce the numbers of your regular army, but you must not reduce the technical services, the artillery least of all, for although a decent infantry man may be made in weeks, a trained gunner, an expert signaller, or a competent engineer is the product of years. Therefore, for the one reason that Mr. Haldane proposes to cut down the artillery, already far too weak from our point of view, I think his proposals stand condemned."

Our French officer goes on to say that Mr. Haldane's scheme provides no means for expansion in time of need, and destroys the militia, the only auxiliary force sufficiently well trained and organised to be of any use for expanding an army available for over-sea work; and he concludes that, judging by Mr. Haldane, England seems to have learned nothing from the South African War, and to be as blind as ever to the danger which menaces her in the armed camps of Europe.

This is the warning of a friend, the view of a friendly and dispassionate observer, and it behoves us to take it seriously to heart.

Two statesmen of first-class ability, the past and the present Secretaries for War, neither of them possessing any technical knowledge of soldiering, but with the best intentions and an absorbing interest in the work, have produced two schemes, not differing essentially in their outlines, but both equally futile in providing us with the force we require.

Both are a patchwork of regular and irregular forces—forces over which the military authorities have entire control in the one case, and a partial or even shadowy control in the other, and of such an amalgam no fighting force worthy of the name can be constituted.

To make up a striking force of 150,000 men, of which only 50,000 are men actually in training, Mr. Haldane would disorganise the militia, depriving it of one-third of its enlisted strength—naturally the best men—for virtually non-combatant work—and we would ask of what value does he suppose that the two-thirds refuse would be either to defend these shores after the embarkation of the expeditionary force, or to supply the wastage in this force incident to active service—a wastage which may be calculated at the rate of 25 to 50 per cent. of the total force in six months.

As to the Yeomanry which are to form a large part of the striking force—and the Volunteers which Mr. Arnold Forster would have abolished if he had had the courage of his convictions—Mr. Haldane proposes *mirabile dictu* to place them under the local authorities—county and borough councils presumably—like provincial fire brigades!

Mr. Haldane's speech of July 12 last was rather hazy on this point, and he appeared to be relying on a report to be made by a committee presided over by Lord Esher in the autumn, but we cannot seriously believe that he intends to hand over any branch

of the military forces of the Crown to the vagaries as such recently constituted elective bodies as the county councils; nor can we imagine how the uniformity which is essential to any great scheme could be expected to proceed from such a delegation. What is wanted is a closer bond between the military authorities and the volunteers, not a loosening of the bonds which exist. What the volunteers demand is to be taken seriously, not to be made a bone of contention in parish politics.

Turning from considerations of efficiency to considerations of economy it is difficult to see how the promised saving of two millions is to be effected by the reductions proposed. It is true Mr. Haldane qualifies the promise by the word "ultimately," but the immediate saving appears to be much less.

The Secretary of State proposes to reduce the establishment of the Foot Guards by 1007, the infantry by 8500, the artillery and Departmental Corps by about 5000, say, 5493, or a total reduction of 15,000 men. The cost of the 204,100 troops allowed for in Vote A is £10,220,000 for pay, so that the charge for a reduction of 15,000 officers and men would proportionately amount to about £750,000. If to this sum be added £136,875 for rations (at the rate of 6d. a day) and £80,000 (a liberal estimate) for clothing, we reach a total of £966,375, or under a million. The remaining million pounds worth of savings must be accounted for by indirect services, such as housing, medical attendance, and pension or army reserve expenses. Long before these will accrue, however, we shall have probably changed our military system again, and the economies now made may well become the source of additional extravagance hereafter.

As already intimated, however, there is an even greater objection to the directions in which the reductions have been made than to the reductions themselves. To say nothing of the two battalions of Guards, whose upkeep is, man for man, less expensive than the line, because they are a shorter time with the colours and a longer time in the reserve, what could be more suicidal than to reduce the artillery and the departmental corps?

It has been the aim of successive Administrations to build up the artillery, in which we were sadly deficient up to within quite recent years, from 80 to 135 field batteries. Gunnery of the present day is of a highly scientific nature, and artillerymen cannot be improvised even to the extent that infantrymen can; so that to reduce the establishment is to court disaster. A battery nowadays is like a delicate piece of machinery, the working of which requires that each separate part should be properly adjusted and able to do the particular duty entrusted to it. To fill up at the last moment a battery with half-trained men reduces the standard of efficiency of the whole, and when this is happening in all the batteries on taking

the field, it would not be surprising to find that the artillery would fail to fulfil the part required of them, on which the whole success of a campaign may depend.

Moreover of the ninety-nine field batteries to be retained, sixty-three only are to be kept on a six-gun basis, eighteen of the others on a four-gun basis, equivalent altogether to eighty-one batteries of six guns each, not ninety-nine batteries fully equipped.[1]

Similarly in regard to the Army Service Corps and the Royal Army Medical Corps, the duties of which it is proposed to transfer largely to the militia. At present the Army Service Corps consists of 459 officers and 6363 men. The total annual pay is £214,000, The horses number 2038; the mechanical transport consists of a fine service of engined lorries and a personnel of 300 men. This corps has been got together with the utmost difficulty during the last twenty years and is now in a splendid state of efficiency—the supply and transport arrangements of the army having been previously in a chaotic condition and the weakest spot in our military administration.

Is this magnificent organisation to be destroyed by substituting *quasi*-civilian militia officers for the trained and expert military officers (all of whom were passed through the combatant ranks and been selected for special aptitude for the duty in the officer ranks) and raw militia men, for the trained and experienced non-commissioned officers and privates, all of whom are trained drivers, grooms, farriers, clerks, butchers, bakers, &c.? Furthermore, if it were desirable to effect the transposition, is there any reason to suppose that militiamen could be obtained or would be willing to enlist for such services, and at a much lower rate of pay than is now given to the men of the corps? At present militiamen are not even liable to serve abroad except with their own consent, and no one with the slightest acquaintance with the views and peculiarities of the recruit giving classes imagines for a moment that it would be possible to obtain any large body of men to accept such responsibilities on any terms whatever.

The same may be said of the Royal Army Medical Corps. To make efficient orderlies and nurses requires a long training and a high standard of intelligence, else things go wrong very quickly in a field hospital, and the death rate goes up by leaps and bounds. The R.A.M.C. militia is recruited from the lowest class of men, and it is seldom one comes across a man of much education or brightness. To replace the regulars in the Corps by such men as these is to minimise the chances of recovery of every poor fellow whom the rigours of a campaign or the enemies' weapons consign to their care—in fact, as a medical officer was heard to remark, it was placing a premium on military manslaughter.

[1] The number of Field Batteries of Artillery in the German Army is 545.

To sum up, in the words of the Secretary of the National Service League, the voluntary system—

1. "Has never given us the numbers required by our needs.
2. "Has never given us forces representative of the *physique* and *morale* of the manhood of the nation.
3. It has never provided the necessary power of expansion in war.
4. It is the most costly and extravagant system in the world, and cannot fail to become more so in spite of temporary reductions.
5. "It is even more costly than appears from the estimates, since there is a greater wastage in death, disease and desertion than in any other army in the world.

"At the present moment the regular army is 17,000, the militia, 37,000, and the volunteers, 102,000 short of the numbers voted by Parliament."

In view of this complete breakdown of the voluntary system; in view of the repeated warnings of Lord Roberts and all our generals in a position to influence public opinion; of our statesmen, our Empire makers and our publicists—in view of the utter futility of the plans devised by men of such transcendant ability as the past and present Secretaries for War, not to mention Mr. St. John Brodrick and Lord Lansdowne, to bolster up the voluntary system, is it not time that we should adopt a modified system of compulsion.

Every European nation has such a system—the United States in the last resort have such a system—our own Colonies all have their plans more or less developed. How long is the United Kingdom to lag behind the civilised world, and offer at the same time the richest prize to the spoiler, and the feeblest defence against attack?

F. Treffry.

THE BEAUTY OF LIFE.

By most persons William Morris is remembered as artist and poet; in his *rôle* of prophet he is less known, and still less regarded. Yet he was emphatically a man with a message for his times, and his art and poetry were a part of that message. His gospel was the joy and beauty of life, and the dignity and happiness of labour when associated with art. The art he desired, however, was not that which is one of the many luxuries of the rich; but "an art which is to be made by the people and for the people, as a happiness to the maker and the user" He would have had the homes, even of the humblest workman, beautiful within and without; the clothing of all classes graceful and becoming, and bright with colour; and every article of daily use not only honest and serviceable but withal pleasing to look upon. Especially was he concerned at the sordid ugliness of modern towns, and their lack of trees and open spaces. For him there was little hope for art without a reformation in these matters. "Unless people care about carrying on their business without making the world hideous, how," he asks, "can they care about art?" He regarded as "the latest danger which civilisation is threatened with," that men in struggling towards the complete attainment of all the luxuries of life for the strongest portion of their race should deprive their whole race of all the beauty of life."

"Until," he says in another place, "our streets are decent and orderly and our town gardens break the bricks and mortar every here and there, and are open to all people; until our meadows, even near our towns, become fair and sweet, and are unspoiled by patches of hideousness; until we have clear sky over our heads and green grass beneath our feet; until the great drama of the seasons can touch our workmen with other feelings than the misery of winter and the weariness of summer: till all this happens our museums and art schools will be but amusements of the rich; and they will soon cease to be of any use to them also, unless they make up their minds that they will do their best to give us back the fairness of the earth."

When art comes to its own, it

"will make our streets as beautiful as the woods, as elevating as the mountain sides; it will be a pleasure and a rest, and not a weight upon

the spirits to come from the open country into a town; every man's house will be fair and decent, soothing to his mind and helpful to his work; all the works of man that we live amongst and handle will be in harmony with nature, will be reasonable and beautiful; yet all will be simple and inspiriting, not childish nor enervating; for as nothing of beauty and splendour that man's mind and hand may compass shall be wanted from our public buildings, so in no private dwelling will there be any signs of waste, pomp, or insolence, and every man will have his share of the *best*."

How many of our cities and towns come up to this ideal, or even approach it? It is "a pleasure and a rest" to come into some old cities such as Oxford, Cambridge, or Chester (to speak only of our own country), where colleges, cathedrals and ancient houses afford the eye objects worth dwelling upon; many small towns and country villages, also, have churches, mansions, or cottages that give pleasure and satisfaction to the beholder; but there is little to delight the eye or soothe the mind in most of our commercial and manufacturing towns. Much has been done in recent years to improve the appearance of their central parts by the erection of costly municipal buildings and other imposing structures; parks, museums and picture galleries, also, have been provided for the people; but the dwellings of the latter are usually dull and uninviting to a degree, and often overcrowded and insanitary. Perhaps the smaller manufacturing towns are the most depressing, since less is done by the municipalities to brighten life for the people. Of such places as Runcorn, Widnes, or St. Helen's, or the Black Country of Staffordshire, I do not propose to speak: no description could convey any adequate idea of their sordid horrors. I am going to describe a small town where the industry carried on is a cleanly one, and which is surrounded by open country on every side; yet to me it is a most dreary place from the lack of architectural interest in its buildings, the absence of trees and flowers, and the seeming deadness of its inhabitants to a feeling for natural beauty, or art of any kind.

The city of Belfast, as is well known, is the centre of the Irish linen industry, but much of the actual manufacturing is carried on in various small towns in the north of Ireland. In my capacity as an art teacher, it has been my lot to visit one of these frequently in recent years, and the more I see of the place the more depressing I find it. I will not name the town as I do not wish to give it unenviable distinction. Its inhabitants, indeed, are proud of it as a flourishing, progressive place; but their ideal does not rise above wide, clean streets, good business, and plenty of employment. In several respects, it must be admitted, they have advantages over many similar communities; but the most deplorable fact is that

they *are* satisfied with themselves, and quite unconscious of the empty and colourless character of their lives.

A mediæval town of ten or twelve thousand inhabitants, such as this, would have been full of interest. It would probably have had a cathedral and many other churches, all in their way "things of beauty," besides a guildhall, a market house, and other public buildings. Its streets, if narrow, would unfailingly be picturesque, and their picturesqueness would be enhanced by the bright colours of the people's costumes, and the frequent processions in connection with church festivals and guild celebrations. The occupations of the people would be more varied and more interesting than those of the town I am about to describe (let us call it X——), and would be carried on without noise, smoke or dirt. If the inhabitants were weavers, like these, their looms would be in their houses, and the fabrics turned out would be beautiful both in texture and design. As for the people themselves, they would be ruddy and strong compared with the modern factory operative; probably, also, they would exhibit better manners, and be brighter and merrier in their lives. In all respects their condition and circumstances would be in strong contrast to those of the dwellers in X——.

This little town stands on a hill, and is dominated (I was going to say) by the high spire of the parish church; but the steeple only dominates it as the spike of a policeman's helmet dominates that article. It adds no charm to the sky line, for it has nothing but height to recommend it; like the rest of the fabric, it is quite devoid of grace or beauty. The church, which is modern, is a large one, said to be capable of seating two thousand persons, but it is just a huge mass of masonry without symmetry or proportion; and being built of black "whinstone" with dressings of lighter coloured stone its appearance is gloomy in the extreme. It is surrounded by a small turfed yard with iron railings, but there is not a single tree to relieve the ugliness of the building.

Beyond the church is the wide open market place, and on market days this is a scene of animation; the incursion once a week of the country people with their healthy faces, their horses and carts, their cattle, pigs and poultry, providing the only relief to the general drabness of the place.

A conspicuous object in the market-place is a handsome fountain with an ample basin some twenty-five feet across; but although I have visited X— hundreds of times I have never seen it playing, nor ever observed water in the basin until I made a close inspection the other day. The latter seems to be regarded as a convenient receptacle for orange peel and market refuse, and is nothing

more than a dirty puddle. I suppose the fountain does not play because of the waste of water, for the people of X— are frugal and practical.[1]

From the principal street, of which the market-place forms the central portion, a number of side streets branch off, occupied for the most part with small dwelling-houses of a most uninteresting and unpleasing type. The vistas obtained along these streets are drearily monotonous, every house being built close to the pavement, without any garden or railing to give it privacy. In this respect, however, the poorer houses do not differ from those of a better class situated in the main thoroughfare; with one or two exceptions these are entered directly from the footpath, so that the passer-by can look into the lower windows of houses occupied by doctors, lawyers, and well-to-do manufacturers.

Many of the shops in X—— are large, but none are high-class, as no doubt the wealthier people do their shopping in Belfast. Looking into the windows, as one passes up the street from the railway station, there is nothing to attract the eye by its quality or beauty; cheap drapery and millinery, cheap ironmongery, crockery and glass, cheap clocks and jewellery, German prints of the poorest description—these are the things that thrust themselves on the attention. There are precious and costly objects in some of the better-class houses, but in the streets of X—— there is nothing to be seen that is calculated to improve the taste, or satisfy the æsthetic faculty. One or two recent buildings—banks and such like—have some architectural pretensions, but apart from these and the waterless fountain, ugliness is rampant.

Another thing that strikes one in X—— is the almost complete absence of trees or vegetation of any kind. The monotony of the principal thoroughfare, about a mile in length, is only broken by some unsightly stumps—once trees, but lopped out of all form—in one of the few front gardens. Looking down some of the side streets which lead to the demesne, other trees may be seen, but these are outside the town itself. The ugliness of the houses is in no case masked by creepers; nor have I ever seen a flower-box in a window of any house, large or small. Some of the more important residences have good gardens attached to them, and there are small strips of ground behind most of the workers' cottages, but these seem to be hardly ever cultivated. On a recent occasion, having time on my hands, I wandered down an unfinished street leading to a green hill in the centre of the town, on the chance of finding something picturesque or interesting in the house-backs and gardens, since there was nothing in the streets. It was a lovely spring

[1] Since this was written I asked one of the residents why the fountain never played; he answered, "Sure, the rates are high enough without that."

evening, with a low sun and clear sky; such an evening as might almost glorify ugliness. I mounted the hill, seated myself on a grassy knoll, and cast my eyes around. There were houses on all sides, most of which had gardens, or what should have been gardens, attached to them, but scarcely any of these were cultivated; most of them were "petty miserable clay-trampled yards." Some had pig-sties and some fowl runs; many others ran foul with slops and refuse: here and there one had been turned up and the ground prepared, evidently for potatoes. In the whole circuit of my view there was just one small tree visible, and not a sign of flowers in any of the gardens, numbering in all probably between one and two hundred. It was a doleful sight and spoke eloquently of utter deadness to the sense of beauty.

At the foot of the hill, and skirting the garden plots of one line of houses, flows what was once doubtless a purling brook, but is now a slowly moving mass of black slime (probably receiving the sewage from these houses), which loses itself in a culvert under the road. Children were playing on the hill-side just above it, tobogganing in an old sack; for children contrive to amuse themselves in the most squalid surroundings. I could not help wondering what ideas these children could have of the brooks of which they read in their lesson books or their Bibles, never having seen anything but this abominable ditch. Only that children do not think much about what they read, they could not but marvel that the hart should pant for such unsavoury drink.

In speaking of the buildings of X——, I did not mention the castle, a palatial modern residence, until lately the seat of Lord X——. It has been uninhabited for a quarter of a century, and a few years ago was sold, together with the demesne, to a syndicate of speculators, who have cut down most of the trees and laid out part of the ground for building sites. As a tenant could not be found for the castle, it was sold at a nominal price to the members of the local Orange Institution, and is now the headquarters of the order for the district.[1] The stately rooms, once, no doubt, filled with valuable furniture, pictures, armour, &c., are now only furnished with trestle-tables and bent-wood chairs. The pictures have been replaced by flaring banners, painted with pictures of King William crossing the Boyne, portraits of Orange leaders, and other characteristic subjects. That of the "Men of Hebron" Lodge has a fearful and wonderful picture of David slaying Goliath, a dab of red paint on the giant's forehead indicating where the "smooth stone from the brook" had struck him, a possible reminiscence on the artist's part of a wound received by some brother in a party riot, for stone-

[1] I am told that the price paid for the castle and five acres of pleasure-grounds was £2200. The house contains some three hundred apartments, and the most modern part alone is said to have cost between eighty and ninety thousand pounds.

throwing is a very usual accompaniment of party processions in the north of Ireland. Over one of the chimney-pieces is a framed oil-painting of the inevitable King William at the Boyne, which, a notice intimates, is to be raffled for the good of the cause.

I was pleasurably surprised to find that so little damage had been done to the interior of the building, seeing that some hundreds of men, many of them belonging to the working class, had been using the rooms for many months. The old decorations are uninjured, though faded with years, and even the floors are not bespattered with tobacco-juice, as I feared to find them, spittoons being plentifully supplied throughout the principal rooms. All the same, I could not help drawing a mental contrast between the present and the past; the throng of beauty and fashion that once filled these apartments, and the luxurious surroundings amongst which they moved, must have formed a very different scene from dingy-coated men with their gaudy sashes sitting round deal-tables in the unfurnished rooms, or tramping the carpetless floors with heavy boots. *Sic transit.* Perhaps the present use of the castle may prove more beneficial, if not more lordly, than its former one, for it is intended eventually to convert a large part of it into an asylum for the orphans of deceased "brethren."

The changes outside are in some ways more deplorable than those within doors. The finest of the trees are gone, as I have said, and roads have been cut through some parts of the demesne. The worst piece of vandalism, however, is the building of a factory, of an uncompromisingly utilitarian character, between the castle and the lake. It lies directly underneath the terrace, and is the most conspicuous object from the principal windows. Thus have the "practical" Xonians treated the only bit of loveliness in the neighbourhood of their town.

Enough of the place! What of the people who dwell in this dreary town? Like human beings everywhere they are of all sorts. In point of morality, if not of manners, they would probably compare favourably with the dwellers in most similar places; they are religious, too, if outward signs are to trusted, for they have many places of worship, and special missions are frequent and popular. I do not sit in judgment on their morals or religion, however; I am dealing with the outward seeming of their lives, and I conclude, from what I have seen, that they know little of the joy of living, and have a very limited outlook on the world. The professional and shopkeeping class have doubtless wider interests than the workers, who form the great mass of the people, for their lives are not so strictly bounded by their environment as those of the latter are. These seldom go beyond the precincts of the town, and maintain a dull enough existence. As I pass through X—— on my way from the station, I meet the operatives coming from their work. Many of

the men are strong and sturdy, but their faces betoken no delight in existence, and their dirty and greasy clothing makes them unbecoming objects. Of the women some are decently dressed and seem to be fairly well off, but the majority, like most factory operatives, wear dingy shawls over their heads, and some of them have no boots or stockings upon their feet. The older ones, for the most part, look careworn and wearied; many of the younger ones, also, are pale-faced and sickly, while their healthier sisters are often bold of countenance and loud-spoken in the strident accent of the North of Ireland.

After-work hours seem to be mostly spent either in the public houses, which are numerous, standing at the street corners, or marching aimlessly up and down. There is a free library to which a small number of men and boys resort; but this, though new, is not a very attractive place, the colourless walls being without pictures or decoration of any kind, except numerous conspicuous notices to the effect that "You are requested not to spit on the floor," a very necessary admonition, considering the habits of a large proportion of the male population. In the town hall there are occasional entertainments of various kinds; of course there are tea-meetings, soirées, &c., at the churches; and there is a branch of the Y.M.C.A.; but most of the young people seem to prefer the streets.

It is perhaps needless to say that there is no picture gallery; nor do the Xonians seem to take much interest in music. I have scarcely ever heard the sound of a piano or other musical instrument coming from any of the houses. The only kind of music that is really popular is that of a "flute band," as it is somewhat humorously called, for the flute forms a very small part in the combination of intruments. If the reader has never heard an "Orange" band, he can form no conception of the monstrous barbarity of the thing: there is nothing to be compared with it outside savage Africa. The band usually consists of a couple of fifes to keep up the "tchune," and any number of drums from one to six or eight; not side-drums, though these are sometimes used also, but big drums of the hardest and noisiest timbre. They are beaten continuously, the performer varying the usual method of playing his instrument by occasionally throwing his arms across his chest, so as to strike the left side of the drum with his right hand and *vice versâ*. Often the ordinary padded drumstick is replaced by a stout cane with which the operator slaps the side of the drum, producing a deafening crash. So vigorous is the drumming that the performer's wrists are sometimes made to bleed by coming in contact with the edges of the drum, the head of which becomes splashed with his blood. The blood-stains are usually allowed to remain, so you may often see a drum being carried through the streets decorated in this manner. On summer evenings,

throughout the parts of Ireland where Protestants are in a majority, the bands go out to practice, and the air is made hideous by the incessant din of the drumming. The fifes are absolutely unheard at a few yards distance, so that the common expressions, "going out with the drums," "drumming parties," &c., fitly describe the nature of the music. On field-days, such as the historic twelfth of July, the district lodges assemble at an appointed rendezvous with their respective bands, which discourse their peculiar kind of music on the march and throughout the day. The "brethren" then are arrayed in their orange and purple sashes, and march behind the banners of their lodges, such as I have described above, the marshals of the procession being armed with brass-headed pikes, or "deacon poles," as they are called. Each lodge has its band, and all play together, so the *ensemble* may be partly imagined. The whole thing is barbarous in the extreme, and would not be tolerated in any community that was susceptible to the influences of sweetness and light.

When the refinements of art, music, and culture generally are lacking in a community, and thought is concentrated on what are regarded as the "practical" affairs of life, the tastes of the lower classes will inevitably run towards low sports and vulgar pleasures. Even the few who keep themselves from such live incomplete and colourless lives. In the "hurrying blindness of civilisation" the higher graces and pleasures of life are regarded as of no account, or as luxuries that may be sought after when the bodily needs and appetites have been satisfied; but it is just these things that raise mankind above the level of the animal. When we have food, clothing, and shelter we have only got the animals' share of life, and our working population are thought to have got all they have a right to ask for when these are secured to them; but the higher needs of the soul are of even a more essential and practical nature than the requirements of the body, for they go to mould the character and make life worth living. Anything that tends to divert the mind from the sordid necessities of life is good for a man or a community; everything that brightens existence, even in its outward aspect, as colour, light, music, art, harmonious movement, or the fall of sparkling water, is elevating in its tendency. When the Urban Councillors of X——— refuse to make the fountain play because of the expense to the rates, they are not acting in the interests of the inhabitants. I venture to say that the constant sight of the plashing water, and the murmuring sound of its fall, would be of as much benefit to the people as the Free Library, for the support of which a penny rate is levied; for the brightness of the fountain every one would share and appreciate; whereas only a minority of the population use the library, and of these probably but a small percentage derive genuine profit from their reading.

I will close this paper, as I began it, with some words of William Morris's, from a lecture on "The Beauty of Life," delivered many years ago at Birmingham. He says:

"That the beauty of life is a thing of no moment, I suppose few people would venture to assert, and yet most civilised people act as if it were of none, and in so doing are wronging both themselves and those that are to come after them; for that beauty which is meant by *art*, using the word in the widest sense, is, I contend, no mere accident to human life, which people can take or leave as they choose, but a positive necessity of life, if we are to live as nature meant us to; that is, unless we are content to be less than men."

George Trobridge.

THE HOGARTH OF ENGLISH POETRY.

THE Court of Charles II. was a hotbed of wit not over delicate and of satire not the most scrupulous, but nothing it ever grew enthusiastic over could approach in mastery of touch or in vigorous fire and go the famous masterpiece of Butler. Nor need the comparison be limited to that period alone, for the whole range of English literature contains nothing the equal of "Hudibras" in its own particular line. It makes the most vigorous onslaughts from the pen of a Byron or a Pope seem ineffective and insipid. A world of truth lies in the words,

"Scriptorum in suo genero, primus et postremus,"

that face us on the poet's monument in Westminster Abbey.

The poem has, it is true, the defects of its author's outlook. From that aspect it is largely occasional and soaked through and through with the Cavalier Zeitgeist, but, from the broader view of literary merit, the faults of harshness and even of truculence pale before the vigour of the treatment and the constant presence of a master-hand. Butler remains the undisputed Hogarth of English poetry. He was indeed wilfully blind to the greatness of the Puritan ideal, but his lines are delightful reading for all that. Perhaps the best proof at hand of the greatness of his achievement lies in this. No work so perversely one-sided and narrow in spirit has ever been so unanimously admitted to be one of the classics of our literature, and that in one sense is no small praise.

Apart from its high merits as a literary masterpiece, it has others that these pages are more especially concerned with. It is a storehouse of apt and telling lines. Have we not the Merry Monarch's own word for it? And he was no mean judge, if all accounts be true. And, to name a lesser man but a greater wit, the Earl of Rochester gave the poem the benefit of his patronising appreciation. Beneath its crust lie scattered many interesting remnants of Puritan England. How often do we meet with the prejudices of the one side or of the other dished up for us in a biting word or two? The book is indeed, in the first and foremost place, a satire—virile, vitriolic, and merciless—but it is more. It is a picture to a large extent dashed in at one place with the broadest brush, and successful at another with the most delicate of touches.

With regard to the theme of the poem, the briefest allusion will

be sufficient. Under the name of Hudibras, we have Butler's idea of the true character of a Presbyterian committee-man and justice of the peace, who "notwithstanding they themselves were guilty of all sort of wickedness, yet pretended to be so scrupulous that they could not in conscience permit the country people to use the diversions they were sometimes accustomed to, of dancing round a maypole, bear-baitings, riding the skimmington and the like." A French critic of the poem wrote: "Hudibras is a holy Don Quixote of that sect, and the redresser of the imaginary wrongs that are done to his Dulcinea. The Knight has his Rosinante, his burlesque adventures and his Sancho."

The spirit, in which the book was conceived by its author, we may take as we find it, and leave criticism of its truth and fairness alone, although it may be said in passing that those who supplied the annotations to the poem frequently out-Butlered Butler in the vehemence of their statements. Let what follows bear witness:

"The chief design thereof is a satire against those incendiaries of Church and State who in the late rebellion, under pretence of religion, slew the best of kings to introduce the worst of governments; destroyed the best of churches, that hypocrisy, novelty, and nonsense might be predominant amongst us; and overthrew our wholesome laws and constitutions to make way for their blessed anarchy and confusion, which at last ended in tyranny."

Even this, however, is eclipsed when this subject is discussed in the pamphlet cesspool of the period. Thus L'Estrange, in his pamphlet entitled "State Divinity," fouls his page. "The Presbyterian school call foul things by fine names. Was the murther of the late King ever the lesse Impious, because 'twas dressed up with Texts and Covenants? Or Judas the lesse Treacherous for doing his business with a knife?" L'Estrange it was also who described the Independents as "not worthy to give guts to a bear," and he seemed to have hated a Jesuit considerably less than a Puritan. "The Jesuit, the bloudy Papist and the Presbyter are both of an age; the year 1535 is remarkable for the Geneva Discipline and the spawning of the Jesuits' order." This kind of stuff is of course preposterous, but it shows that, had there been a Puritan genius with Butler's gifts, he would have been amply justified in writing a counterblast to Hudibras. It does seem a pity that on this occasion the hour did not produce the man.

On the subject of the literary merits of the poem the opinions of Butler's vindicators are, if it is possible, even more absurd. We stand prepared to admit many of the literary beauties of "Hudibras" but it is too much to ask us to swallow this: "The critical notes are designed to prove that it is at least equal to the most celebrated poems in the English language, and its conformity in

some respects to epic poetry will be evinced and comparisons here and there drawn from Homer, Virgil, and Milton." This is enough to make even Butler blush, for it seems more likely that in his own candid opinion he would have said that the only thing epic about "Hudibras" was its length.

But let us to the text, which in itself is a big enough haystack even if the needles be plentiful. Probably the best known and most frequently quoted lines are those that hit off the manifold foibles that obscured the real greatness of the Puritan character—foibles that were present in a greater or less degree in the majority of the Roundhead element. In Cavalier eyes at least, even the genius of Cromwell was not free from the taint of charlatanism. Butler was not slow to make the most of this, and, as the Puritan clergyman was perhaps of all the easiest to hit, he plants his rankling shafts in him with special delight. "The long-eared rout" with "drum ecclesiastic," get it straight from the shoulder in such lines as these:

> "Such as do build their faith upon
> The holy text of pike and gun."

Or again,

> "Compound for sins they are inclined to
> By damning those they have no mind to."

A greater than Butler held much the same opinion when he declared that "The Puritans hated bear-baiting, not because it gave pain to the bear, but because it gave pleasure to the spectator." Macaulay, however, frequently twisted his matter to suit his style. *Pereat veritas!* But let the epigram sparkle.

On the Church as a whole Butler was equally severe. The lines that follow are from a long tirade in which he compares Church assemblies to a bear-garden—not by any means to the detriment of the latter:

> "Synods are mystical bear-gardens,
> Where elders, deputies, churchwardens,
> And other members of the court,
> Manage the Babylonish sport.
> For prolocutor, scribe, and bear-ward
> Do differ only in a mere word.
>
> . . . .
>
> The difference is the one fights with
> The tongue, the other with the teeth,
> And that they bait but bears in this,
> In th' other souls and consciences."

In the same strain we have:

> "A Bear's a savage beast, of all
> Most ugly and unnatural,

Whelp'd without form, until the dam
Has licked it into shape and frame.
But all thy light can ne'er evict
That ever synod-man was lick'd
Or brought in any other fashion
Than his own will and inclination."

One of the little weaknesses of the Puritan, which Butler turns to account, was their love for coining new words. Apart from the common occurrence of their altering their names and substituting scriptural phrases, often extraordinarily laughable from an outsider's point of view (all will remember Praise God Barebones of Parliamentary fame), they gloated over such words as out-goings, carrying-on, nothingness, workings-out, gospel-walking-times. Some of these, by the way, have held their place in the language. As Butler puts it, the Puritan

"could coin or counterfeit
New words, with little or no wit,"

while he was engaged in weaving

"fine cobwebs, fit for scull
That's empty when the moon is full."

Others noted the same defect, as the author of "A Dialogue between Timothy and Philatheus" speaks of "the then fashionable gibberish, saints, people of the Lord, the Lord's work, light, malignancy, Babylon, Anti-Christ."

Butler's gibes at the Republican press—the newspaper or "Diurnal" then printed every day in favour of the rebels—are generally specimens of the better side of his sarcasm. His lines,

"And registered by Fame eternal
In deathless pages of diurnal,"

are none the less effective because they lack the scurrility that marks this contemporary account: "The country carrier when he buys the diurnal for the vicar, miscalls it the urinal, yet properly enough; for it casts the waters of the state, ever since it staled blood."

The number of quotations illustrating the customs and beliefs of Butler's day and generation is so numerous that a respectably sized volume might easily be filled with them. A complete collection of them as a matter of fact would go far to embrace no small part of the general life of the time. Let us content ourselves with a few. Many of his similes have somewhat lost their point because of the altered view our own time takes of many of the popular

ideas then in vogue. Thus we find reference made on several occasions to witchcraft:

> "Mould 'em as witches do their clay,
> When they make pictures to destroy."

The belief in omens, so common among many nations in earlier times, and not altogether dead yet among the more ignorant, furnishes this comparison:

> "Portending blood, like blazing star,
> The beacon of approaching war."

Stow's Annals gives an account of the blazing stars and comets that have appeared in England at various times. In Butler's own day the great storm that raged at Cromwell's death was commonly believed to have foretold that event:

> "Tossed in a furious hurricane
> Did Oliver give up his reign."

A contemporary tract remarks upon the same, "that Oliver, after a long course of treason, murder, sacrilege, perjury, rapine, &c., finished his accursed life in agony and fury, and without any mark of true repentance." This storm is one of the irrelevant details that every schoolboy remembers. But how many, who may be familiar with this incident, recollect that there was a similar storm in the northern counties on the day the House of Lords ordered the digging up of Cromwell's body along with that of the other regicides? Such a belief was by no means confined to this country. The comet seen at the death of the Emperor Charles V. was also regarded as a portent. Scott in his *Marmion* writes of the

> "Fearful lights that never beacon
> Save when kings and heroes die."

And, last but not least, readers of Shakespeare's *Julius Cæsar* will recall his masterly description of the prodigies that heralded the approaching death of the master of the Roman world. Butler, by the way, also alludes to this:

> "When Cæsar in the Senate fell,
> Did not the sun eclips'd foretell?"

The degrading nature of some of the punishments of the Puritan period is referred to in this couplet:

> "Like caitiff vile, that for misdeed
> Rides with his face to rump of steed."

It is a historical fact that on one occasion several members of

the army were punished in this manner for petitioning the Rump for the relief of the oppressed Commonwealth.

The frequency with which Butler refers to bear-baiting shows that it had remained a favourite form of amusement down to its abolition by the Puritans. Several lines illustrating this have already been quoted. In fact, of Butler's elaborate comparison of the Presbyterian synod and a bear-garden, one of his annotators says: "I would observe in this place that we have the exact characters of the usual attendants of a bear-baiting fully drawn."

The apt simile in

> "Still amorous and fond and billing,
> Like Philip and Mary on a shilling,"

may be partly lost to the general reader of to-day. The allusion is to the shillings that were struck in England when the Tudor Queen Mary married Philip of Spain, afterwards of Armada fame. The profiles of the two faces, contrary to the usual practice in coinage, were placed facing one another. This oddity of the coin strikes any one who has seen it very forcibly. If history speaks truly, the billing and cooing seems to have got no farther than the shilling.

Some of Butler's happiest efforts at ridicule are obtained from his mastery of a trick of rhyme, which few have used so effectively. As examples, we may select the following:

> "Fortune th' audacious doth *juvare*,
> But lets the timidous miscarry;"

or,

> "More honourable far *servare*
> *Civem*, than slay an adversary;"

or,

> "Whether bears are better
> Than Synod-men? I say: *Negatur*."

These lines, it must be admitted, are the very antithesis of poetry, but they hit the mark none the less. It is, however, when our author rises above his party spleen that we get his finest lines and see his sound, practical commonsense. Addison said that his favourite line was the second of the following couplet:

> "Quoth she, I've heard old cunning stagers
> Say, Fools for arguments use wagers."

But one can find its match in

> "A skilful leech is better far
> Than half a hundred men of war;"

or,

> "Success, the mark no mortal wit
> Or surest hand can always hit;"

or,

> "So cowards never use their might
> But against such as will not fight."

A favourite line is, after all, mainly a matter of individual taste, but in my opinion it seems open to doubt whether Addison could have successfully maintained a just reason for his preference. For pith and expression any of the other three couplets would not have disgraced the hand of Pope.

It has already been noted that "Hudibras" has the defects of its author's outlook on his subject-matter. But it has more in the manner of treatment. Once in a while Butler treads dangerously near to scurrility, although allowance must be made for an age that so frequently mistook evil-speaking for outspokenness. Apart from that, Butler tried no high flights; he knew his limitations, and within them he was a supreme master. The well-known lines, perhaps the most often quoted nowadays of any that he wrote,

> "And like a lobster boil'd, the morn
> From black to red began to turn,"

sum up his homely yet telling style better than pages of criticism could do.

The comparative failure of "Hudibras" as an indictment against Puritanism was due to its prejudice. Butler hit hard and often, but, unwittingly let us suppose, he frequently hit below the belt. With all its faults in this respect, the poem has remained his monument. As Drayton writes:

> "And tho' no monument can claim
> To be the treasurer of thy name,
> This work, which ne'er shall die, shall be
> An everlasting monument to thee."

It has another, a less personal, and a wider claim than Drayton seeks for it. It is in its highest flights the finest sermon against cant and hypocrisy that was ever written in our tongue, with perhaps the one exception of Burns's "Holy Willie's Prayer."

UNDERGRADUATE FREAKS AND FROLICS.

MAY-WEEK! Commemoration! the Encœnia! What visions and memories these words conjure up of young Oxford and Cambridge in their gala days of the summer term, when the two ancient universities are all ablaze with light and colour. Up from the river comes the silvery plash of oars, and from college chapels the rolling swell of thundering organs; across the venerable courts and quadrangles sisters and cousins in gay attire trip merrily, while over all the bells of great St. Mary's chime.

It is emphatically *the* season of the undergraduate year, and fun and frolic have full sway.

"A lark, a lark, my kingdom for a lark," might well form, to parody a familiar line, the motto of 'Varsity life.

From the days of Verdant Green downwards, many an author has depicted the scenes that annually take place.

The conferring of honorary degrees is a popular occasion for the display of the undergraduates' frolicsome propensities.

Such days have in many cases become historical. A description of any one of them might well serve to justify the title at the head of this article.

And such a typical day which we will select as not too ancient to be fresh in many memories was November 24, 1898, the occasion of the visit of the Sirdar, since known as "Kitchener Day."

It was not till after lunch when Lord Kitchener, in the red robes of a Cambridge LL.D., set forth for the Senate House that the excitement began. In the space in front of this historic edifice a gigantic crowd had assembled, singing and shouting.

Every window was full, and undergraduates were clinging to roofs and chimneys and hanging by railings and pinnacles in impossible positions. The first result was the fall of the whole line of heavy iron railings with their occupants clinging to them like ants; broken limbs and bruises resulted, fortunately nothing worse.

The arrival of the Sirdar was the signal for wild shouts, which could be heard for miles around.

The conferring of honorary degrees in the Senate House is usually an operation somewhat lacking in the dignity and

solemnity associated traditionally with this ceremony. More and more is it becoming a raree-show, with the undergraduates literally and metaphorically forming *the gallery*. A large number of the seats are reserved for the wives and daughters of M.A.'s, whilst the M.A.'s themselves are crowded into a sheep-like pen where they look and feel extremely uncomfortable. Overhead the gallery, unmoved by the solemnity of the occasion, keep up a continued stream of applause, songs, would-be wit, and shoutings.

The Sirdar's degree was no exception. As he entered amid a temperate amount of applause from the ground-floor, from the gallery a certain popular song concerning the going qualities of the little British army swelled into triumphant chorus.

Right opposite his seat a gigantic effigy of a Dervish, with black face, white clothing, and limbs worked on strings, jerked and jumped for the delectation of the hero of Khartoum. The public orator, Dr. Sandys, attempted his Latin speech, but it was mainly drowned by a shower of irrelevant and irreverent remarks—"The Sandys of time are sinking," "These Sandys are worse than those in the Soudan," "Give him a brandy and Sirdar," and similar doubtful witticisms. At length the ceremony was over, and amid final wild shouts the Sirdar retired. Outside, enthusiastic undergraduates had removed the horses from the carriage, and drawn by many willing hands the triumphant car rolled back to Christ's. At the entrance, however, the wheel caught in the gateway, and the carriage was shattered; in a moment the crowd were upon it, and Lord Kitchener was compelled to fight his way to the Master's Lodge surrounded by the too eager enthusiasm of his fervid admirers. "Hotter than Omdurman," was his own comment on this proceeding. The carriage was broken up for mementos, and the crowd slowly drifted out from the court into the street. At the Union, where the honorary membership of the Society was to be conferred upon him, an immense crowd waited for the Sirdar. But, taught by experience, he slipped in by a back entrance and retired by the same way.

All through the day excitement had been increasing, and by the evening it was evident that something out of the ordinary would happen. In the middle of the market-place a few boxes of shavings kindled by a few choice spirits rose into fitful flame. Hither all congregated. Fuel was present everywhere in the shape of hoardings, palings, and scaffold poles. The fire swelled into a gigantic blaze, and pandemonium reigned supreme. The scene was a memorable one—the market-place packed with a seething crowd, in the centre a colossal flame glaring to heaven in smoky clouds, and round about on all sides squibs, rockets, Roman candles, and dedonators making night hideous. A continual roar filled the air, rising to a louder shriek of triumph as now one now another pillaging party rushed in from the side

streets triumphantly bearing a gigantic fence or pole or seat or sign-post. Later, as excitement increased, the mob got completely out of hand. In Jesus Lane the "men in blue" met a wild body of marauders face to face, and withstood a heavy charge. But as a matter of fact the police were quite powerless. Wild throngs of men tore about the town uprooting trees, tearing down shutters, impounding everything burnable—wheelbarrows, bats, goal-posts, notices of Advent services, shutters, barbers' poles—all went the same way, and found the same end. The windows of houses round Market Hill were shattered with squibs and rockets. Not until the early morning did the flames subside, when they were finally extinguished by the fire brigade. The next day a doleful spectacle was presented: the market-place windows looked like a sacked city. The "backs" of the colleges looked as if an army of locusts had passed by: not a fence or paling or movable piece of timber was anywhere visible. The damage was estimated at over £500, and a subscription was at once opened to compensate the injured tradesmen. The Vice-Chancellor has announced that stringent measures will be taken to prevent a recurrence of such bonfires, but in the one debate that has been held in the Senate on the subject there was a difference of opinion as to whether it is advisable to wholly prohibit them or not.

"Bonfires" have always been the favourite mode which undergraduates have adopted for expressing their feelings. It is only a few years since a large bonfire, nearly equal to the Kitchener conflagration, was ignited on the Market Hill in celebration of the vote of the Senate which refused degrees to women. This has since been known as "Women's day." The first public bonfire at Cambridge of which we have any authentic account occurred in 1382. It was really a protest of the town against University encroachments; but of course undergraduates were only too glad to participate in the orgies. The ringleader, one James de Grantchester, with the connivance, it is said, of the Mayor, who ought to have known better, got together an armed mob. They first sacked and burnt the houses of the University officials; then they proceeded to St. Mary's Church, and possessed themselves of the common chest of the University. From this repository they extracted the charter, bulls, and other muniments, which they carried off in triumph to the market-place. There they broke the seals of the charter with a club, after which they piled up a huge bonfire and burnt everything amidst the rejoicing of the populace. An old woman, whose name has been handed down to posterity as Margaret Sterr, gathering up the ashes, scattered them to the winds, exclaiming "Away with the learning of the clerks! Away with it!"

College bonfires have been very common from early times. In Byron's time, one night a large bonfire was made of boxes, planks,

and all available material. There are four emblematical figures placed over the noble and beautiful library in Neville's Court (in which library may now be seen the life-like statue of Byron himself). These figures were clothed in surplices and other adornments. Several tutors lived on each side of the court, but these had been carefully "screwed up" in their rooms beforehand. Great pains were taken to discover the culprits, but in vain, even the names on the surplices had been unpicked. Another freak of Lord Byron's was the keeping of a *bear* in his rooms, which was a great source of annoyance to the Dons. Not even dogs are admitted inside the college gates. Byron used to say of his bear that it was "the first in the world, and intended to sit for a Trinity Fellowship."

We must not forget, however, that there were in former times fires at which undergraduates played a much more heroic part. At the beginning of this century arson was a most common crime, and a most common mode of revenge. About 1810 one man was hung for firing *eleven* unprotected farms, where water was often very scarce. Thrilling scenes were often witnessed on these occasions. We can imagine the blazing stacks, the horses almost screaming with terror, the moaning cattle and helpless, bleating sheep, and even the very birds whirling and falling into the flames. By the light of one enormous fire at Coton, it is said that print was read at night time *twelve* miles off! On these occasions the undergraduates often came nobly to the rescue, and through their instrumentality it was that many a farmstead was not completely demolished. Tennyson, no doubt with lively recollections of his college days, tells in one of his poems how *these hands have passed the bucket down the line.*

Before leaving the subject of fires, we may just allude in passing to the well-known story of the poet Gray, as an instance of undergraduate sportiveness. The future author of "the knell of parting day" had the utmost horror of fire. The "curfew" rang then, as it rings still, in the old University town, but it did not cover the fires of fun and frolic which burned in the breasts of his hilarious fellow students. He had rooms at Peterhouse, and had constructed an elaborate means of descent in case of fire. One night, after he had retired to rest, the undergraduates of the college raised a loud cry of "Fire! Fire!" though it should really have been "Water! Water!" for poor Gray, letting himself down by his rope, landed in a large butt of water which his tormentors had placed just beneath his window. He complained loudly to Dr. Barnes, the master of the college, a queer old man in knee-breeches and gaiters, quite one of the old school, who has been described as a man of wrathful "words but gentle doings"; but he did not get much consolation, whereupon he emigrated in high dudgeon to Pembroke College over the way.

The mention of Gray recalls a prank played by two undergraduates of his time, of which a most curious old picture still survives, and may occasionally be met with in old print-shops. The incumbent of one of the Cambridge churches in Gray's time was a man of very diminutive stature—hardly more than four feet high. One day, as he came down Trinity Street, which is very narrow, two burly undergraduates prepared a strange and rude reception. When he was close to them, each delinquent suddenly raised one leg at right (or shall we say "wrong"?) angles with his body, and pressed foot to foot with his fellow, and the poor vicar had to pass beneath this strange and humiliating yoke.

Wine-parties were the scene of many mad merry-makings in former times, but they are almost unknown now in these abstemious days. We remember how our late Laureate describes his impressions, when he revisited his Alma Mater:

> "I past beside the reverend walls
> In which of old I wore the gown;
> I roved at random through the town,
> And saw the tumult of the halls:
>
> . . . . .
>
> "Another name was on the door:
> I lingered; all within was noise
> Of songs, and clapping hands, and boys
> That crashed the glass and beat the floor."

Occasionally, however, riotous scenes still occur at *bump-suppers*—*i.e.*, suppers held in honour of a college boat having gained several places on the river. The Dons, however, are very tolerant, and shut their eyes, as a rule, to much that goes on on these occasions, unless any wilful damage or insubordination occurs. A general spirit of good-fellowship and *esprit de corps* prevails; songs are sung and toasts drunk.

Here is a specimen verse from a very old Trinity boat-song:

> "Raise the shout of glory,
> Tell once more the story
> How the Mother hoary (*i.e.*, Alma Mater Cantabrigiensis)
> Hails each victor son!
> Peals of joy attend her,
> Stalwart arms defend her,
> Loyal hearts befriend her,
> *Trinity has won!*"

We have already alluded to the scenes in the Senate House on the occasion of the Sirdar's visit. This was perhaps the most disgraceful part of the proceedings, yet the "horse-play"—for it can be called nothing else—is sanctioned by many precedents and long custom. Let us picture to ourselves the scene as it is yearly enacted on the ordinary Degree Day, and periodically enacted on any

extraordinary occasion of accademical importance. The galleries of the Senate House are packed with undergraduates, and the body of the hall below with officials and spectators and by the candidates for degrees themselves, whilst a limited space is reserved for ladies and wives and daughters of M.A.'s. As there is a good deal of waiting on all such public occasions at Cambridge, the undergraduates in the gallery proceed to amuse themselves. This amusement is often carried to a perfectly insane pitch. Proceedings generally begin with three cheers for the King; then follow cheers for any popular personage of the day. By this time, perhaps, some one is observed below who has not taken off his cap on entering. "Cap! Cap!" is the immediate cry, which is kept up till it is removed; if the offender does not comply with the request at all, very often pennies are hurled at him with dangerous vehemence. At last the proceedings proper commence by the Esquires Bedell, and the Vice-Chancellor marching up to the throne in Indian file to the undergraduate accompaniment of left! right! left! right! repeated to *n* terms, then halt! which alas is unnoticed. Anon Mr. Proctor comes forward, and reads over very pensively a number of bills not unlike Income-tax papers—these are technically called "Graces." He is laughingly bidden from the gallery to "speak up Georgy." Things are rather slow, and a company of whistlers strike up "Nancy Lee," who by this time ought to be married and settled in life. An admirer of the clock, owned by some one's grandfather, once tried to introduce "tic, tic, tic," but it proved very doloreux. And now the Tripos men are presented to the Vice for their degrees. That there are favourites can easily be seen, and these mostly athletic men. 'Well collared"—"well shot"—"well rowed"—"well kicked"—show what each was famous for. A particular favourite is honoured with the song, "For he's a jolly goood fellow."

Cheers are given for anybody and everybody. The chief dignitary in the Sandwich Islands, having addressed a large meeting in Cambridge, was insolently greeted with "Three cheers for the Bishop of Hullabaloo!" The United States were once called for, when the cry was drowned with laughter, and calls of "the dis-united States."

When any celebrity is presented for his degree, the Public Orator introduces him in a Latin speech. This is always the signal for unseemly interruptions—"That will do, sir, now construe," and similar witticisms being of frequent occurrence. When Darwin was presented for his degree, the undergradutes lowered a monkey from the gallery with a placard round its neck, "the missing link." When Tennyson came up, he was greeted with the question, "Did your mother call you early, call you early, Alfred dear?" At the sight of a well-known aeronaut who was to be honoured with his

LL.D. degree, the undergraduates burst forth into the well-known song, "Up in a balloon, boys, up in a balloon!"

On one occasion (1882) a Proctor unwisely attempted to intercept the wooden spoon which is always conferred on the last junior Optime. Thereupon a fearful scene of disorder ensued, and the V.C. (the master of Peterhouse) caused the galleries to be cleared before he would proceed with the conferring of degrees. The day which the outer world most associates with turbulent scenes at either University is, of course, November 5. This is the day of "Town and Gown" famous from time immemorial. The conflict is now practically abolished, but in former days when manners were rougher, and retained something of the prize-fighting element, it was sometimes a more serious affair. An undergraduate of those lawless times once described his sensations as he lay on the ground with a big blackguard kneeling on his chest, and remarking affably to his mate, "Fetch me a stone to fettle his mouth with."[1]

Most of these Homeric encounters have been consigned to oblivion like the kings who lived before Agamemnon for the lack of a bard to hymn the deeds of daring done on either side. One however, perhaps the most memorable of all the "Town and Gown" rows—that of 1846—has been rescued from the darkness in which the rest lie buried and forgotten, for it found a Homer in the late Mr. Tom Taylor. The *casus belli* was as follows: In March 1846 the American dwarf Tom Thumb was exhibited at Cambridge. He was shown in the morning for half a crown, in the evening for a shilling, the latter being for the townspeople, the former for the University, who then, as now, were supposed to roll in wealth. But lo! and behold, the exhibition room was empty in the morning and crowded at night by all the undergraduates. The burghers, indignant at what they considered an invasion of their rights, hustled the undergraduates, who were not slow to retaliate. The struggle from a skirmish on the first night, became a battle on the second and an organised riot on the third. Each side claimed the victory, but the police used their truncheons so ruthlessly that many undergraduates were seriously wounded, so that it was commonly supposed that the "town" triumphed.

Not long afterwards a ballad appeared in Macaulay's style, from which we may make a few quotations. It is headed "The Fight of the Crescent."

"The sturdy Undergraduates
Are pouring in amain,
Up from the fair Rose Crescent
The Market Place to gain;

[1] One of the earliest of these "Town and Gown" rows of which we have any record was early in the seventeenth century, when the townsmen of Cambridge thought they had a grievance, which was set forth in the "Townsmen's Petition." The last serious riot of the kind was the "Death Riot" of 1875, when the Undergraduates testified their dislike of John Death, who in that year was Mayor.

From many a wild wine-party,
From many a sober tea,
From the distant halls of Downing,
And the courts of Trinity."

. . . .

"Then out-spoke good Tom Noddy—
A son of Trinity—
'Lo! I will stand at thy right hand
And the Crescent keep with thee,'
And outspoke merry Pebbles,
A Johnian was he,
'I will abide at thy left side
And the Crescent keep with thee.'"

. . . .

"'Down with him,' cried false Seabrook,
As he mopped his bloody face,
'Now yield thee,' cried the Inspector,
'Now yield thee to our grace!
But brave Tom Noddy never deigned
An answer, no not he;
But he floored the Inspector neatly
As a man might wish to see.

. . . .

"But he was rusticated
By the Dons that very night,
And when he showed them his black eye,
They said it served him right.
But long at our wine-parties,
We'll remember how like bricks
Stout Noddy kept the Crescent
In eighteen forty-six!"

The mention of this parody of Macaulay's lines recalls to my mind a very famous scene at Cambridge, when it was first proposed to admit women to the same examinations as the men. The older members of the Senate bitterly opposed it, and some very clever lines were put forward, beginning

"Emilia Girtonensis
By the Nine Muses swore,
That the great House of Girton
Should suffer wrong no more!"

Great riots formerly occurred at the Stourbridge Fair, which took place a little to the east of Cambridge, at one time by far the largest and most famous of all the fairs in England, and resorted to by merchants from all parts of the kingdom. In 1605 the fair was first attended by hackney coaches from London, and the crowds of people assembled some years were so great that upwards of 60 coaches have plied at one time. The University used to attend it *en masse*. Two theatres were kept going, and the scenes of revelry must have been indescribable.

Times, however, have changed, nor is it likely that the following

circumstance could occur nowadays. It is said that many years ago a young spark was in the habit of absenting himself too frequently from chapel. One of the tutors finally asked the reason of his neglect. The morning service was at 7 A.M.

"The fact is," said young Impudence, "you are too late for my early habits!" "Too late!" exclaimed the astonished Mentor, "how can that be?" "Yes, decidedly too late! Make it five and I'm your man!" The undergrad wanted to attend chapel on his way home from an all-night carouse!

Many, indeed, are the freaks and follies of young men at the 'Varsity.

Not very long ago a member of Queen's College, and a "rugger blue" was "rusticated" for "ragging" in a man's rooms, and the somewhat severe punishment was very much resented by his brother undergrads. To mark their disapproval a funeral procession was organised, composed of some thirty cabs, headed by one containing the victim dressed in black, with crape hanging pendant from the top hat he wore. The *cortège* left Queen's at a funeral pace, the drivers having crape attached to their whips, and most of the followers displaying crape. At the station a large crowd had assembled. Groans were given for the Queen's Dons and cheers for "the blue." The "train departed amidst a most exciting scene to the strains of 'Auld Lang Syne,' and 'He's a jolly good fellow!'"

Such are some of the ways in which our young men disport themselves at the 'Varsity.

Two years ago we all read of an amusing hoax played on the Mayor of Cambridge, when a sham Eastern Potentate was palmed off on his hospitality, and still more recently we have witnessed amusing scenes at the voting on the Greek question, when such placards as these were exhibited:

"PLUMP FOR PLATO!"

"ARE WE TO BE RULED BY THE VICAR OF LITTLE-CUM-GO?"

In most cases all this is a mere working-off of the exuberance of animal spirits.

The ordinary undergraduate has plenty of pride in, and patriotic admiration for, his Alma Mater, and in his heart would fully echo the sentiment of this verse of a very old Cambridge song:

"All hail thou Mother of our Sires!
Hail home of learning pure and free!
Thou Altar whence the sacred fires
Leap ever over land and sea!

E'en as they knew thee,—still the same
  Our hearts would know thee now;
Still rest the glory on thy name,
  The laurel round thy brow."

J. HUDSON.

NOTE: No reference is made in the above article to Oxford, the author being a Cambridge man, but an Oxonian will readily recall similar instances of undergraduate playfulness in the annals of his own University. Some years ago a whole college was "sent down," and strange scenes were witnessed more recently at Christ Church, to say nothing of the occasion of the Blenheim Ball.—J.H.

WOMEN AND PURITY.

THERE is a theory held by a large proportion of the women of the civilised world that the guardianship of social purity has been bestowed by the Higher Powers upon themselves. Translated into more common-place language, their belief is that men are by nature prone to err, and to wander from the paths of peace and holiness into other ways, not to be mentioned; and that it is woman's prerogative and duty to guide their wandering steps. Who has not heard the leader at a mother's meeting, platform speakers, those engaged in any branch of social work, pleading with their fellow women to "guard the purity of the home." The same idea finds currency in much of the fiction written by women, in the domestic circle, &c. Our purpose here is to examine into its origin, and then to see to what extent the average woman acts in a manner calculated to promote real purity, and to what extent, while pursuing a line of conduct she may imagine to be a righteous one, she is in reality exerting a retrograde influence.

Brushing aside all fables and fictions, and going to the very root of the matter, it will be seen that the idea that woman must help man has sprung from the fact that woman can be an inspirer. Much of the work of creative genius the world over has been done under the inspiration given by a woman. Bringing the matter down to the region of every-day life, who has not observed the remarkable mental stimulation and arousing of sluggish energies which ensues when the quite ordinary young man gets in the condition which is known as being "in love." The general activity of what many people call the lower nature will then become specialised, and, *under fair and natural conditions*, to a large extent transmuted into mental and other activities. It is observations along these lines that give us the key to the widely felt prompting that woman must help man. The thing rests mainly on the capability of woman, under certain conditions, of being an inspirer; and the capability of man, under those conditions, of transmuting energy which usually manifests on the physical plane into mental and other energy.

Then, accepting the evidence, of which there is much, that women can play a great part in the cause of purity, what is the first thing necessary if they are to do all that they can? Clearly the first thing is for them to know themselves sufficiently well to

make sure that they are themselves pure. A pure marriage is one in which not the smallest alloy of other motive comes in and mixes with the love. And by *love* be it noted, we mean not mere liking or affection, but simply and solely *la grande passion.* We assume that love should be the basis of marriage because that belief is so deeply ingrained in human nature that no matter how it may be buried under philosophies and temporary customs of man's invention, it always struggles through and asserts itself. Every one *knows* it in their hearts, even when, in order to justify their actions to themselves, they try to coax themselves into a different belief. Sir James Crichton-Brown, writing recently on the degeneration of the race, said: "Old-fashioned, unsophisticated love is, I believe, the best guarantee of a happy, fruitful, healthy marriage, and to allow love to have its way unbiased by sordid, vulgar, ambitious considerations, but guided and guarded by a sense of duty and responsibility, is perhaps as good a way of restricting hereditary degeneration as the proposed new marriage licence would be. The affinities subjected to no undue conventional duress or restraint generally make for righteousness in the physiological sense, and where they occasionally go wrong they carry their own limitation with them."

Nature knows best, and not only as regards the physical condition of the race, but also as regards its mental and moral attributes. The fine qualities of the "love child" have become proverbial. Old-fashioned, unsophisticated love is Nature's guide not only to health and strength, but also to purity and righteousness. So ingrained, so axiomatic, is the idea, that it would not be necessary to refer to it at all if it were not for the fact that a few persons—who have possibly observed some shipwrecks in the storms of passion—will sometimes be found insisting that marriages of simple affection are best. They do not realise that it is not the passion that is at fault in the wrecks they have seen. There are others, too, who from a different motive will say the same thing. But although many women talk like this, they never really kill the ideal in their hearts, which is just that old mysterious, but glorious, unsophisticated love, which turns a humble cottage into a palace, and a humdrum man into a hero; which fires the imagination, and stimulates all the powers of heart and brain.

And this brings us back to the point that before women have a right to speak of purity they must look to it that they are themselves pure. Many women think that so long as they are faithful to the man they have married they are absolutely chaste. But this is a terribly low ideal. And it is just because this idea does prevail that there is so much vice among us. The "pure" marriage is one in which no other motive, or consideration, than the *fire* of love is allowed to enter. But there are many women who, because they

do not examine themselves closely, make compromises. There are some, including many inexperienced girls, who do so from ignorance. Because they are in love with Love, and anxious for him to come, they see him in every guise. And the older women look on and say nothing. The frankly, brotherly manner; the attentions which many genial men pay to every girl they come in contact with; a mild flutter of interest they construe, in their ignorance, into indications of *le grande passion*. And many a marriage which has proved a failure has been the result of a man accepting the situation when he has seen what was expected of him.

Then there are women of more knowledge and experience, who, when Love does not come along, in their fear lest they shall be left what they imagine to be "out in the cold"; or because they are uncomfortable in their home life; or because they would like a home of their own; or because no monetary provision has been made for their future; or because they feel lonely, and think they won't if they are married; or because they find it hard to earn their livelihood; or because they shrink from the opinion of "other women," who consider that any husband is better than no husband —for some of these reasons they coax themselves to believe that affection is love, although deep in their hearts they know that this is not so. And the first step in this direction having been taken, the affection deemed necessary may thin down to vanishing point in respect, and this again thin down to include any man who is not positively repulsive to them. Every one knows there are a large number of women who marry in this way, although they seldom adopt this attitude openly. It would be much better if they did, as it would tend to less confusion on the subject of marital unhappiness. The method adopted in such cases has a tendency to run on these lines: An engagement having been arranged, sometimes with the judicious assistance of relations, it is next deemed necessary to talk sedulously in a way to give the idea that the affair is really a romantic love-match. This is partly done, no doubt, in the hope of deceiving themselves. They try to coax themselves to believe that they have not been untrue to the ideal which is planted in the heart of every true woman.

This attitude regarding marriage has become to be so generally recognised that for a woman to sue a man for breach of promise is not regarded as in any way ignoble. And the men who compose the jury, accepting women at their own valuation, will often award substantial damages to the woman, who should herself have been the first to draw back. Again, there are numberless women who see nothing discreditable in allowing their relatives, when the lover lags, to push matters on their behalf. Yet see what this means! While woman's actions are on such a low level, her claim to be the guardian of purity becomes a farce to laugh at. For where is the

purity of a woman who can contract such a marriage? Or of those who can look on, seeing nothing degrading in such a thing? Those who do these things, or are capable of doing them, have yet to learn what purity means. And until they have learnt that, instead of helping man upward, they are dragging him down to his lowest level.

It is because women are false to their ideals that they have in a large measure lost their power. Their special gift is the gift to stimulate. If they are true to the instinct which is hidden in the heart of every true woman, which makes her feel repugnance for intimate relations with any man until the one comes along for whom she is able to stir, and who stirs for her, that fire of passion which is able to turn a prosaic world into a fairy-land, they will then be in a position to speak of purity without bringing the word into contempt; and will also learn something of the power which is vested in womanhood.

And this brings us to the question of the wielding of that power. The women who have that fine instinct which makes them shrink in horror from intimate relations with any man until they come across the one with whom they so blend that such relations seem both holy and natural—lose all ugliness and materiality—have, embodied in the instinct, a feeling which makes them unable to conceive the possibility of such blending except where they have aroused all the fire and the deepest depths of a man's nature. The fire of love bringing with it, as it invariably does, the arousing of all the latent potentialities, the key to the highest and deepest possibilities of the man are then in the hands of the woman. Presuming it is not necessary for her to demand any unnatural restraint from him, she can now help him tremendously. Then comes the second great test of the woman. We will suppose that, so far, she has followed the right path. Now, with the power in her hands, what will she make of it? How will she use it? That will depend whether she is materially-minded or the reverse; whether she is selfish or unselfish; whether she is childish, petty, and given to dwell on trifles, or large-hearted and large-minded. Has the man, with all the finest possibilities in him fired, to come *down* to her level? Has he now, when he has as much of the making of a god in him as he will ever have in this life—has he now to exhaust his mental energies in condoling with the loved one because the new dress won't be home in time for Sunday; because she is sure that So-and-So is talking about her and laughing; because she can't go out on her bicycle? Has he to bring his conversation down to the gush or the giggle of the schoolroom, to the small talk of the milliner, of the nursery, or the kitchen?

It is often said that the passion of love terminates with the honeymoon, and that all the accompanying poetry then turns to

prose. Certainly the fire and the poetry sometimes seem to be very short-lived. There are cases, however, where both survive on through the passing years. If we examine carefully we shall find almost invariably that in the former cases the woman's thoughts are largely engrossed over her hats and antimacassers, or her kitchen and her linen closet. That such power as she has had has been wielded in obtaining from her husband new blouses, pieces of furniture, or some other thing which her self-centred thoughts have made to appear desirable. That the atmosphere of the home is so saturated with little material details that the inspiration of a prophet would desert him on the threshold. That, because she is wholly lacking in a deep inward life, lacking in spirituality, she allows every little trifle to be a source of trouble. And that, consequently, instead of stimulating the unfortunate man who happens to share the house with her, she would sap from him any inspiration he might happen to have. The fire of love has died because it has had nothing to feed upon.

Then if we examine the cases where it has lived on through the passing years, we shall find that it is where, in vulgar parlance, the woman has had something "in" her. Where not only has she refused to mate except where the *fire* of passion has brought the arousing of all the deepest potentialities, but where—because of her quick sympathies, her mental alertness, because she is not herself materially minded—she has been able to feed these potentialities, to supply an atmosphere in which they can wax strong. Where all the subtle, indefinable instincts, the *poetry*, of womanhood have been in full play, accompanied by depth of feeling and breadth of sympathy; where the woman can *give* as well as take in the mental and the deeper life. Not only is the *fire* of love kept alive, but the whole of the man—physical, mental and spiritual—is fully satisfied. While the physical aspect sinks into a normal condition in the activity of the mental and spiritual. And such a thing as wandering glances become wholly out of the question.

Two articles have recently appeared in the *Contemporary Review*, by Mr. George Barlow, on "The Higher Love," in which the writer gives emphasis to the spiritual side of what is sometimes regarded as physical love. In referring to the portion of Rossetti's "Love Lily" which runs:

> "Whose speech Truth knows not from her thought,
> Nor lover body from her soul."

Mr. Barlow suggests that the poet was here face to face with a secret probably more wonderful than he himself had any idea of. That he was in fact face to face with the "living soul" of the woman he loved. "*That the glory that drew him was the glory of the angel in the woman, visible for the moment to the angel*

within himself." May it not be that the *fire* of love too often withers, dies, because there is no "angel" there; nothing there in fact that can appeal to the soul of a man. So that the glory he momentarily thinks he sees slinks away in some hidden recess of his brain?

Seeing nothing ignoble in contracting a marriage entirely lacking in fire and poetry, so long as it be solemnised according to the letter of the law of the land; seeing nothing derogatory in continuing an intimacy which has lost both fire and poetry, a woman will often assume an attitude of what may be called "aggressive morality" which her actions by no means justify her in taking. No matter what the nature of the feelings of herself and the man she has married, either towards each other, or towards other people, her moral outlook will usually focalise itself along one definite line: she must hold this man rigidly to her side. Should he, owing to her lack of vigilance, have wandered, she must force him back. If to force back his wandering thoughts be impossible, she must keep strict guard over his steps lest they too shall wander. If they have already wandered lest they shall wander yet again. If we probe very closely into the hidden motive which prompts this attitude we find that while in some instances it springs from a real belief that in this way the interests of religion and morality are best served, in others it is assumed because womenshrink from the world knowing how light is their hold on the man they have married. It may be a hard saying, but their strenuous fight has often no connection with purity—although they may more or less try to coax themselves into the belief that it has. They are really striving for what is most agreeable to themselves. Now, what help can a woman who takes this attitude give to a man who is more or less entangled in a mesh of the senses? There may be persuasion and exaction of promises to keep along a certain path. But although he may sternly adhere to the line laid down the inner man is not affected. The inspiration by which he can rise being wholly lacking, at best, the only thing which can be attained is a deadening of the senses, which deadening not seldom extends also to the mental faculties. So that a kind of general inertia prevails. While not seldom it will lead to an accentuating of the love of the mere unstimulating physical comforts which he is told he may legitimately enjoy. So that he becomes gradually, we might almost say, *soddened*, by the uninspiring dominion of the senses at their lowest.

If we look into the average home in suburbia, it will be found that it is just this state of deadness that a large proportion of the women are seeking to preserve. In some cases there has been no *fire* of love; in others it has died for want of fuel, leaving nothing but the ashes. In both cases it often means an accentuating of wholly unstimulating physical desire. Often it is felt to be of not the

slightest consequence to the women that they should themselves be entirely uninspiring; that their companionship should mean inertia to the man they have married, and the chaining of the spiritual ego—supposing there to be one—more and more under the dominion of the wholly uninspired physical senses. The thing which seems to them of importance is that what they consider to be the "sanctity of the home" should be preserved; that the feelings and actions of this man should run along the line that the law of the land has legitimised; or, in the appalling eventuality of their not doing so, that *appearances* should be maintained.

Nor is this all. Where there is suspicion of wandering inclinations, there is often much questioning of a childish and injudicious character, followed by protestations and the exaction of promises. Who of those who are acquainted with the under-currents of life does not know the woman who—to put the matter in blunt and vulgar language—"coaxes a man to bamboozle her?" The woman who makes it impossible for him to speak the truth unless he is willing to be brutal; who exacts the confession of half-truths, which we all know are "ever the blackest of lies"; who extorts promises it is impossible for him to keep? Many women not only seek to wriggle themselves into the inner depths of a man's consciousness, but do so in such a way that it is manifest that if they find there anything they do not like they will make a scene of some sort—either the shedding of tears; or protestation, and the exaction of promises; or, may be, vituperation. Of these scenes, with which many men are familiar, the last is probably the most to be desired. A man can remain truthful under vituperation; while with the other two, if he happen to have a bent towards chivalry and kindliness, this is well-nigh impossible. Then it comes about that where women adopt this course, men, either from a desire for domestic peace, or because they hate to inflict pain, or possibly because these inner depths are sacred to them, resort te evasion and lies.

Then there is another method to which a woman will sometimes resort, the effect of which is equally baneful. When she has reason to suppose that the state of the feelings of the man she has married are not all she could desire, she will vigorously and determinedly act as though they were. Some even go so far as to ask for a simulation of devotion whether it is felt or not. The unfortunate man may be truth-loving by nature, but what can he do? Willy-nilly he is forced into a position he knows to be a false one; forced to assume outwardly that which he knows to be a lie. To sum up the effect of all this it will be found to be that *to lie to a woman has come to be regarded almost as a virtue.* While in many a home there grows such an atmosphere of dissimulation and deceit that it eats like a canker into the deepest life of a man. Then looking at our homes as we know many of them to be, we are forced to realise

that there are many cases where the women who try to imagine that they are standing at the door to guard the sanctuary from impurity are really serving a very different purpose. That the atmosphere of their homes is such that all the finest possibilities of the man at the helm are becoming deadened, while his spiritual susceptibilities are being blunted by his being driven to subterfuge, lying, and deceit.

Then a word as to the children. It is a very common thing, where matters are not all that could be desired, to hear that appearances must be maintained "for the children's sake." Any one who has devoted any time to the branch of investigation which goes by the name of psychical research, is aware that there is much evidence that thought power is of far greater potency than is generally imagined. That it affects people unconsciously. Many who have never given any attention to such research have observed that the state of *feeling* of the adults of a household will, in some subtle, indescribable way, affect others of the houshold. Those who watch closely know that want of harmony among the elders, even when there is no quarrelling, has an irritating effect among the little ones. And just in the same way they feel all the other conditions of their elders. If they are to grow up true, open, and with all the best tendencies, they must grow where the atmosphere created by the elders is clear, harmonious, and stimulating. Children require what may be called moral sunshine, as much as they do physical sunshine, if they are to grow up harmonious and true. A home atmosphere, such as we have been describing, which unfortunately prevails in a large number of homes, is as bad for the children's characters as the lack of fresh air and sunshine is for their bodies. Half-unconsciously they feel the subtle influences even when outwardly all is fair. There is something lacking, something irritating, which disturbs them, and sometimes distorts them, just as keeping them in a close fœtid air would affect and distort their bodies,

Moreover, there is the pre-natal life to be considered. Science may yet have to determine whether, not only the thoughts, but the sub-conscious brain action of the mother, and also those subtle psychic influences to which reference has been made, acting during the pre-natal period, may not be able to fill some of the gaps left by the theory of heredity.

E. I. Champness.

SEXUAL MORALITY.

SEXUAL Morality is a subject not often discussed either in speech or writing. Most persons have, however, from time to time allowed their thoughts to dwell upon and have formed some ideas, perhaps for the most part nebulous, concerning it. Considering that the matter is one in regard to which every man and woman is more or less interested, and a matter, moreover, which is of supreme importance to the human race in general, the disinclination to discuss it publicly, is not easily comprehensible. Why this mock modesty? What is the reason of this spurious delicacy? Why should nearly every man and woman affect to be oblivious of problems of vast, of vital importance, problems the satisfactory elucidation and solution of which would be materially aided were they properly and publicly thrashed out?

To answer this question aright it would be necessary to hark back many centuries and trace the growth of the idea adopted, but not invented by, Christianity—that a repression of one particular natural instinct, and that the most powerful, was an act particularly pleasing to the Deity and bringing to the person so stultifying his or her nature a great and certain reward in the world to come. The Vestal Virgins of Rome were a striking instance of this whimsical belief whose origin may be traced even further back until it is lost in the twilight of obscurity. The Vestal Virgins were an instance of this belief, but they were also an instance of the fact that men and women may hold beliefs, and yet find it impossible or impracticable to carry them into effect. The Vestal Virgins were vowed to chastity, but, unless history is utterly unreliable, they, like many other mortals before and after them, found that nature was stronger than their vows. It is not necessary to go back to the days of ancient Rome for evidence of the fact that the repression, or attempted repression, of the sexual instinct is supposed to be pleasing to the Creator who implanted it. There are men and women to-day who take vows very similar to those of the Vestal Virgins and keep them, some with difficulty because nature is strong, others with less difficulty because nature in them is not so strong, but all with the idea in their minds and forming a prominent part of their religious belief that the degradation of nature in this one respect is a meritorious act. Others there are, again, who take vows and cannot keep them, and lead lives of shame and misery because they continue to affect

what is deemed a virtue they no longer possess. Such persons have not the moral courage to throw off the mask and boldly declare that the feelings and instincts which God has given them they cannot repress, and that they decline to be any longer hypocrites. We must feel sorry for these votaries whether male or female, sorry that they should become and continue hypocrites, but more sorry that they should ever have taken vows which are degrading and, when rightly considered, disgusting, prejudicial to health, and injurious to the community at large. The idea that what is often incorrectly termed "chastity" is peculiarly pleasing to the Almighty, has affected not only those persons absolutely vowed to it, but, it is hardly any exaggeration to say, has directly or indirectly largely influenced the whole of Christendom.

The Reformation in this country and the Continent, though it gave the quietus to many venerable superstitions, did not eliminate the feeling which the ancient Church had fostered that sexual relations between the sexes was a matter which must neither be discussed nor publicly referred to, but should, at the best, be regarded as a necessary evil, while the refraining therefrom was an extremely laudable act altogether pleasing to God. This idea is yet very far from being extinct, and, even where it is not implicitly held, its effect, which has come down through all the ages, on the opinions of mankind as to the relations between the sexes, and in reference to the whole question of what I have termed sexual morality, is still potent.

The object of intercourse between man and woman was originally what the Prayer Book terms "the procreation of children," the replenishment of the race. In what are often very erroneously termed the "lower animals," sexual intercourse is almost solely directed to this object. The superior animal, man, has developed what he calls sentiment; and one particular sentiment, commonly termed love, has arisen to complicate the sexual question and divert sexual intercourse from its original object, the procreative, and substitute for it the pleasure-giving one. It has, in a word, elevated the means over the end; and the end is, as a consequence, not only for the most part lost sight of, but often despised and even guarded against. It would be entirely outside the scope of this article to exhaustively investigate the cause and nature of what is vaguely termed love. Poets have sung of it and novelists have cherished it as the be-all and end-all of existence. We have been told *ad nauseam* that it is the one pure, the only unselfish passion; and people have read so much of its being so that they may be pardoned for having accepted this view of the matter without seriously—or, indeed, at all—investigating it for themselves. I admit that what is called love—*i.e.*, a feeling of mutual attraction between two persons of opposite sexes—is capable in very exalted

natures of developing very noble feelings; but I emphatically deny that such is the case as regards the ordinary "love affair" of an ordinary man and woman. Love is largely a matter of propinquity or contiguity or environment, sexual desire being the inspiring motive. I am aware that this fact is denied, and, no doubt, the assertion of it will cause a large number of worthy people to become extremely angry. But, despite the affected delicacy of mankind in this matter, and the attempt to exalt what is vaguely termed love into the region of poetry or even religion, I fear the fact must be boldly stated that love is in reality a synonym for lust. Unfortunately, lust is a word the accepted meaning of which has been entirely perverted from its proper one, and, in some person's minds, lust has come to be regarded as, if not a disease, at any rate a morbid condition of the sexual feelings due to excess or uncontrolled licence. Lust is, on the contrary, a perfectly natural, entirely healthy emotion, common, in greater or less degree, to every physically complete man and woman. To infer that the existence of such a feeling is something to be ashamed of is only part and parcel of the cant and hypocrisy which characterise the world's treatment of the sexual relations as a whole. Love in a healthy man or woman is lust superinduced by other considerations, no doubt. I, of course, admit that lust can exist without love. The existence of what is euphemistically termed "the social evil" is sufficient evidence of that fact.

Whenever anything in reference to the relations between the sexes is treated of publicly, whether in a magazine article, a work of fiction, or on the stage, a certain section of the community, a section whose capacity for making a noise is, I believe, quite out of proportion to its numerical size, is, or professes to be, extremely shocked. Questions of this kind, *i.e.*, in regard to the relations between man and woman, we are told ought not to be discussed in public, and any tendency in that direction is, it is asserted, merely pruriency run riot. The mischief of it is that the people who so loudly and vehemently put forward their opinions to this effect are very rarely answered, and it accordingly has come to be tacitly assumed that they are the representatives and the exponents of virtue, and that all who differ from them are—otherwise. Consequently those who differ, by their silence affect an acquiescence they do not feel for fear of being branded as something that they certainly are not. I think it is quite time that a stand were made against this, not disinclination but fear, to discuss one of the most important matters affecting not only the race generally but every individual member of it. The sexual relations and the various matters in connection therewith are the only points regarding the human race in reference to which there is no educational process A boy is taught everything except that which is of greatest import-

ance to him. A girl is rigorously guarded against any knowledge of her most important function in life, the conception and bearing of children. Why this conspiracy of ignorance? Why is the boy allowed by his parents to go forth into the world and learn those matters which every youth ought to know, only by his own sad experience and in too many cases by a bitter passage through the morasses of sin and the filthy sloughs of disease? Why is the girl permitted to grow up in ignorance of the most elementary laws of nature connected with the sexual relations and sexual functions, with the result that too often she falls a victim to the ignorance and because of her "fall," as it is termed, is ever afterwards cold-shouldered and shoved into the gutter by those extremely righteous persons of both sexes who are convinced that knowledge in regard to sexual matters should only be acquired when it is too late to apply it, and too frequently acquired in a manner which ought to have been, and might have been, avoided had even some scanty rudiments of knowledge been imparted by those responsible out of the ripeness of their own experience.

There is a vast amount of cant in reference to all sexual questions. No matter how we look at them, or at anything directly or indirectly connected with them, it must strike the honest-hearted man or woman that in regard to them the world is altogether out of joint. Morality and immorality are words that fall glibly from many lips, but what do they mean? What is our code of morality in reference to the sexes? Is it common to each, or is there a different code for each? If there be, and of course every one knows that there is, on what is it based? Morality implies religion, since I take it that moral laws are religious obligations as opposed to legal enactments. If that be so how can any honest, impartial man defend this code of morality which most men and many, if not most women, implicitly if not explicitly accept and approve? That code of morality in effect is that a man may gratify his sexual feelings very much as it pleases him, his "conquests" being in fact something to be proud of, whereas a girl's one lapse from virtue instantaneously renders her to all intents a social pariah whom all good women, if they respect themselves, shun. It may be, as Macaulay says, that "The moral principle of a woman is frequently more impaired by a single lapse from virtue than that of a man by twenty years of intrigue." He explaims this seeming paradox by the assertion that "a vice sanctioned by the general opinion is merely a vice," while "a vice condemned by the general opinion produces a pernicious effect on the whole character."

"One," exclaims Macaulay, "is a local malady, the other is a constitutional taint." The statement, like many others of Macaulay's, is probably too sweeping, but it is, I think, in the main true. That

it should be so says little for our moral principles. A vice may or not be sanctioned by the community, but it is a vice all the same. A single lapse from virtue on the part of a woman is on precisely the same footing as a single lapse from virtue on the part of a man. I am aware that the community, as Macaulay says, think differently, and some of us attempt to bolster up our differential principles by physiological reasons. But, after all, the fact remains that the general opinion referred to is almost altogether the opinion of men, and men have an interest in being what is called impure and in keeping the female sex what is called pure. Purity, in my opinion, is more a condition of the mind than the result of the particular action of a particular member of the body. A woman may be anatomically pure, for lack of opportunity, from excess of caution, or from many other reasons, and yet her mind may be a hotbed of impurity. In these matters words and phrases are used in an improper sense or without their meaning being duly defined.

Let us clear our minds of cant, to use the Carlylean apostrophe. In no matter is it so necessary as in reference to the sexual question, for in regard to no other is there such a plethora of cant, such a mass of hypocrisy, such a vast amount of encrustating verbiage. To understand the sexual question, to come to a right determination in regard to it, it must be discussed; in fact, a discussion thereof would largely tend to settle the matter, Because all the confusion that obtains in reference to it, all the difficulties connected with it, are mainly, if not altogether, the outcome of a misunderstanding or total ignorance in reference to the sexual feelings and functions and their object. If boys and girls were educated on that point and taught at an age when the mind is receptive and the inclination and will are easily moulded, that the function of the sexual organs was reproduction and reproduction only, that when used for any other object man was degraded far below the level of the animals he calls lower, we might confidently look for a vast improvement in the morals, not to speak of the physical health, of the community. The greatest scandal of our so-called civilisation is surely the presence in our streets by day and night of those unfortunate creatures who live by ministering to man's lust, and who are, as a rule, incapable of exercising the function which should be woman's glory, that of conceiving and producing offspring. The pimp and the prostitute are the grossest satire on our vaunted civilisation. When man comes to recognise his true sexual function he will regard with amazement, mingled with horror, the existence of a class whose moral principles were, as Macaulay says, first impaired by a single lapse from virtue, and who continue to ply their traffic mainly because the community which has made them what they are places every obstacle in the way of their becoming anything else.

Sexual morality is, I admit, a difficult question to tackle in a

magazine. The difficulty is not so much in reference to the question itself as in regard to the ideas and prejudices of others in respect of any discussion of it whatever. People seek to make the secret of sex a kind of Eleusinian mystery, and it is often merely the curiosity to solve it which has led many a young man or woman to commit an act which, in spite of Macaulay's dictum, has, I believe, an equally pernicious effect on the moral principles of both. If there were no secret there would be no curiosity to discover it. Very much the same may be said—I have already touched on the point—in reference to most of the sentiment, poetry, and nonsense spoken or written in reference to love. Why do the high flown, high falutin' sentiments of a "love letter," read in a breach of promise action, invariably cause "loud laughter" in Court? Why is ante-nuptial and post-nuptial conversation so absolutely different? Why do men who apostrophise the eyes, the ears, mouth, cheeks, and so on, of their *fiancée* talk round their subject, their objective point, before marriage, and eschew this sentimental twaddle after desire and expectation have been merged in realisation? The whimsical and exaggerated chatter of the lover is too often termed poetry, and his sentimental rhodomontade is frequently assigned considerably more importance than it deserves. Love has been termed the apotheosis of unselfishness, and many, nay most, women look back with tenderness on the days when they were addressed in terms frequently incongruous, and for the most part ridiculous, and they received a fulsome adulation which, in their hearts, they must have known was merely the illogical, not to say incoherent, rhapsody of a man in a passion. Time kills, time and the hour, and the moment of realisation is the suicide of frenzy. The man returned to his right mind may treasure and venerate the being who is his and for him for life, but he will not again address her in the language of Bedlam. Passion in such a case is succeeded by affection which has nothing in common with passion, and is frequently its very antithesis.

The desire of sex has, I know, elevated many men to heights of nobility just as it has degraded others to depths of depravity. Man has made his so-called moral laws and defined, for the most part tacitly, in what degree and in which direction and how far either sex may impugn or defy them. These laws are made in man's interests, and for his own selfish objects and desires. In the making of them he has trampled under foot the aspirations and desires of the female and left her to be chiefly regarded as merely his toy or plaything to minister to his pleasure and to be exploited as he may think fit. It would be possible to write at considerable length on this latter point, but I shall refrain. For woman as a whole, as the world is, the sex desire is a thing to be repressed, for the man it is a passion to be ministered to, excited, exalted. In this fact

lies a whole world of tragedy and comedy. I shall not seek to explore it further. I shall leave the task for other pens. I shall rest satisfied if these words of mine give occasion to a few men and women here and there to think earnestly and deeply on what is really a question of terrible seriousness, a question which, more than any other, perhaps, affects not only the race, but every, or almost every, individual member of it. It is at least a question deserving of serious thought and serious resolves, needing to be seriously discussed in an earnest spirit absolutely free from prejudice and preconceived ideas.

H. R. BOYLE.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

SCIENCE.

MODERN scientific men are devoting increased attention to the part played in nature by extremely minute particles, the existence of which was not even suspected a few years ago. Not only have minute quantities of hitherto unknown gases been detected in our atmosphere; but it has also been abundantly proved that even the purest air contains innumerable solid particles, and there is good ground for the belief that these particles play an important part in meteorology, causing the condensation and precipitation of aqueous vapour under certain conditions. With the ultra-microscope it has even become possible to see these extremely minute bodies, and in some cases to count and measure them. One of the best known devices for counting such particles is Aitken's dust counter; but for continuous observations additional apparatus was needed, and this has been supplied by the ingenious inventions of Dr. Carl Barus, of Brown University, Providence, U.S.A. With the aid of his improved apparatus, Dr. Barus has for some time made continuous observations on the number of nuclei present per cubic centimetre in the air at two stations in the United States. The results are recorded in a monograph published by the Smithsonian Institution.[1] Among the interesting conclusions drawn by the author from his observations may be mentioned that the maxima and minima of nucleation in the atmosphere occur during the winter and the summer solstices respectively. The continuation of these researches will no doubt add much to our knowledge of the microscopic constituents of the earth's atmosphere.

The spread of interest in scientific matters in this country is well shown by the fact that 100,000 copies of E. Haeckel's *Riddle of the Universe* should have been sold since its appearance in an English translation. A new edition of that translation, to which the translator, Mr. J. McCabe, has added a preface, has recently been issued.[2] In the preface Mr. McCabe deals principally with Haeckel's critics; but we think he takes some of them too anxiously; their names are only known because they venture to criticise so

[1] *A Continuous Record of Atmospheric Nucleation.* By C. Barus. Washington: Smithsonian Institution. 1905.

[2] *The Riddle of the Universe.* By E. Haeckel, Translated by J. McCabe. Fifth Edition. London: Watts & Co. 1906.

eminent a scientific man, not because they have any personal knowledge of the subject on which they write.

Another work of Haeckel's has now been made accessible to English readers by the same translator. Vol. I. of *The Evolution of Man*[1] has just appeared and is shortly to be followed by the second volume. The first part of the work deals chiefly with human embryology, and, although the subject is a highly technical one, yet with the aid of numerous excellent illustrations it will not be difficult for the lay-reader to follow Haeckel's main arguments. Among the chief points of importance, the gastræa theory may be mentioned, which is clearly explained and which has so important a bearing on the subject. The translation is well done; but in some cases the English equivalents of German expressions are not altogether happily chosen; we may mention "steam-cell" as an instance.

The rearing of children has of late years almost attracted as much attention as their education, and it is not surprising that a third edition of so popular a handbook as Dr. H. Dutton's[2] is called for. Free from all technical language, the author describes the treatment which, in his opinion, is most likely to conduce to the rearing of healthy children. On the whole, Dr. Dutton's advice is sound and calculated to bring about the end in view; but in some cases we cannot quite agree with his views. For instance, the use of borax for the hair is open to grave objections, and it is very doubtful if phosphate of lime, administered to a child as such, can be assimilated. There are other compounds of phosphorus far more suitable for the purpose.

PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.

The seventh volume of *A History of the English Church*,[3] published by Messrs. Macmillan, edited by the late Dean of Winchester and the Rev. Dr. William Hunt, deals with the greater part of the eighteenth century, that is from the accession of George I. (1714) to the year 1800. This proves to be one of the most interesting volumes of this very useful series. It has not, of course, the same value to the student of history, for as a matter of fact the Church

[1] *The Evolution of Man.* By E. Haeckel. Translated by J. McCabe. London: Watts & Co. 1906.

[2] *The Mother's Guide to the Feeding and Rearing of Children.* By T. Dutton, M.D. Third Edition. London: Henry Kimpton. 1906.

[3] *The English Church from the Accession of George I. to the End of the Eighteenth Century (1714–1800).* By the late Rev. Canon John H. Overton, D.D., and the Rev. Frederic Relton, A.K.C. (*A History of the English Church.* Vol. VII.) London and New York: Macmillan.

of England in the eighteenth century cannot be said to have had any history, that is to say, during the period with which this volume deals no structural or constitutional changes took place in the Church, it passed through no crisis, it accomplished no great work. After the Restoration Settlement the Church truly settled down and remained undisturbed by divisions within or by assaults from without. Jacobites and non-jurors accepted George I. and the peace of the Church was assured. The Church had, practically, for the first time since the Reformation, the opportunity of justifying its existence and distinguishing itself by its good works. The authors of the present volume, however, have to admit that it failed, and confess that no lover of the English Church can study this period without a blush. "It is," we are told in the introduction, "a period of lethargy instead of activity, of worldliness instead of spirituality, of self-seeking instead of self-denial, of grossness instead of refinement." Almost the only distinction which belongs to the Church of the eighteenth century was the intellectual activity of a few of its leaders, but even this activity was for the most part confined to the field of theological apologetics. Though, as we said, no assault was made upon the Church as an organisation, vigorous assaults were made upon its theology by men of great learning and ability, and these attacks called for the most strenuous defence from the orthodox side, which naturally took that particular form of intellectual activity which is almost the only claim of the Church of the period to respect. But the apologetics of the eighteenth century are now out of date, and probably the only works which are read are those of Paley and Butler, or Law's *Serious Call to a Devout Life*, which, in spite of its title, is a very entertaining book. Many of the defenders of Church doctrine were themselves more or less heterodox, and only succeeded in meeting the attacks of their rationalistic opponents by a pretty free use of reason, and often rationalising theology until very little trace of orthodoxy remained; the most intellectual party in the Church were the Latitudinarians, and the earliest modern Unitarians were to be found in the Church of England. One of the most interesting movements in the Church during the period was the anti-subscription movement, which culminated in the petition which was agreed upon at the meeting at the Feathers Tavern in the Strand, July 17, 1771. About two hundred and fifty signatures were obtained, of which many, our authors confess, were those of Deists, Socinians and Arians, though presumably all were members, and many clergy of the Church of England. The petition was duly presented to Parliament, but was rejected by an overwhelming majority. The petition scarcely represented the strength of the movement against subscription in the Church which was favoured by Edward Law, Watson and Paley. We do

not suppose an anti-subscription movement would meet with any more success to-day. The failure of this movement was followed by the secession from the Church of several well-known men, who became avowed Unitarians. Controversy was the principal feature in the religious history of the period, and with it this volume deals with the necessary fulness, and the names of Locke, Toland, Tindal, Hume, Priestley, Whiston, Clarke, as well as those of Butler, Paley, Warburton, Hoadly, Horsley and Watson frequently recur, and though our authors claim that the victory in such contests was obviously on the Christian side, we think that this opinion is largely due to pardonable bias, for though the ground of the controversy has shifted, the theology of the Church of England never stood so much in need of defenders as it does at the present day. There is really more interest in the history of Dissent and Rationalism in the eighteenth century than there is in the history of the Church of England, but for this, of course, our authors are not to blame. We have had throughout to speak of the "authors" of this volume, for though it was originally allotted to Canon Overton, he had only prepared a rough draft when his lamented death occurred. Mr. Relton undertook the writing of the volume, making the best use he could of Canon Overton's material, so that the volume is a composite production; and though Mr. Relton credits Canon Overton with nearly one half of the matter of the volume, there is nothing to suggest, so admirably is it used, that the whole credit of the volume should not be given to Mr. Relton.

It requires genius or a special kind of talent in a writer to make the subject of logic interesting, and this, it appears to us, Mr. C. E. Hooper, does not possess, notwithstanding his undoubted ability to deal with the subject. *The Anatomy of Knowledge*[1] suffers under the disadvantage of being a preliminary essay to a larger work which may never be written—for Mr. Hooper admits in his final paragraph that though he believes himself to be in possession of certain genuine clues to an explanation of certain universal principles, his opinions concerning them are to a considerable extent unformed, and that the questions referred to demand more study and thought than he is likely to be able to bestow upon them for months or years to come. In such a case we do not think this preliminary essay can be of much service to any one but Mr. Hooper himself. "The Anatomy of Knowledge" is not used by Mr. Hooper as a fanciful title to his book, but as indicating his conception of knowledge as a quasi-organic thing, the philosophic analysis of which may be compared to the anatomy of an organism. The analogy may be suggestive, but we think Mr. Hooper carries it too far. As little

[1] *The Anatomy of Knowledge.* An Essay in Objective Logic. By Charles E. Hooper. London: Watts & Co. 1906.

more than a bare outline of epistemology, this work is carefully and thoughtfully written, but it is rather scientific than philosophical.

Reconnoitres in Reason,[1] by Mr. Norman Alliston, is a small volume of discursive essays of a philosophical character, which appear to have no very definite object; we should suppose the author wrote them for his own amusement, and they may afford a little amusement to the reader. We should do them no injustice if we describe them as clever, though it is a doubtful compliment, and Mr. Alliston has a turn for paradox. The essays comprise such subjects as "On Contraries," "The Limits of Determinism," "Eventuality" and "The Abstract Idea." The reasoning is at no time profound, and some of it approaches the commonplace. We think the writer is at his best in the essays of a pschycological cast, entitled "Egoistic," which show an ingenious insight into some human characteristics. The second part of the volume, "The Table Book," is more to our taste, for here the writer exhibits more of the humour which is evidently latent but kept in check in the essays. For instance, in referring to the theory that beauty and utility are never in conflict, he calls to mind the unbeautiful aspects of town buildings, factories, workshops, railways, &c., and wittily says: "Ah, finely may the text-books talk; beauty is a fugitive here below, and man—this barbarian at heart—pursues her, brick in hand." Indeed, throughout this portion of the volume there is exhibited much quiet humour and good sense.

An excellent idea, admirably carried out, is our estimate of a small volume, by M. Jean Lahor, which bears the title *Le Bréviaire d'un Panthéiste*,[2] which calls to mind Dr. Stanton Coit's *Message of Man*; but M. Lahor's book is much fuller and more useful. It provides rendings of an elevated character, infused with a truly religious spirit, but free from any taint of orthodoxy or conventionality. It is the kind of book for which we expect an increasing demand as time goes on. There are so few books of a religious character which an intelligent unbeliever in orthodox theology can open without being repelled by the limitation of the thought, and the miserable conventionality of the language, to whom M. Lahor's book will appear a veritable boon. The title *Bréviaire* suggests that such a book may be to the Rationalist what his Breviary is to the Catholic—a *vade-mecum* and daily companion, an aid to reflection and a guide to conduct; for though M. Lahor calls his book the Breviary of a Pantheist, one need not be a Pantheist in any strict sense to be able to enjoy it and profit by it. For the major part, the book consists of passages selected from the higher literature of the world. There are quotations from Hindoo and Persian

[1] *Reconnoitres in Reason and the Table Book.* By Norman Alliston. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, & Co. 1906.

[2] *Le Bréviaire d'un Panthéiste et le Pessimisme Héroïque.* Par Jean Lahor. Paris: Librairie Fischbacher. 1906.

books, from the philosophers and poets of Greece, from Latin writers, and not a few from the moderns, such as Goethe, Hugo, Pascal, Vauvenargues, Voltaire, Carlyle, Coleridge, and many others; while these passages are interspersed with original meditations by M. Lahor. The sentiment which seems to have guided M. Lahor in his selections may be described as Pantheistic stoicism, a lofty feeling at once religious and heroic. This book gives the "lie direct" to the reiterated assertion of the clergy that without dogmatic theology there can be no morality. We might seek in vain through whole libraries of the Fathers and Doctors of Divinity for material for a book which for morality could compare with this.

SOCIOLOGY, POLITICS, AND JURISPRUDENCE.

Slave-owners, as a rule, both ancient and modern, treated their slaves well—at any rate, as well as their cattle—recognising that to ill-treat them was to lessen their labour-power and depreciate their market value. With the employers of "white slaves" on the other hand, it has been with few notable exceptions far otherwise. In their eyes their employés were merely "hands"—instruments of production—to be used up regardless of waste, since for the starvation wage offered countless hordes were waiting to compete. It is a curious phenomenon that the hard clear-headed manufacturer so seldom recognised that it paid him to pay attention to the physical, mental and moral condition of his employés. Upon this question the practical man of business proved himself as unbusiness-like as he was, and is, unpatriotic. In *Model Factories and Villages: Ideal Conditions of Labour and Housing*,[1] Mr. Budgett Meakin has gathered together practical examples of industrial betterment schemes which business men have found it worth their while to create in order to promote the moral, physical, and social welfare of their workpeople. As Mr. Meakin rightly points out, one scheme may not suit an employer which has proved satisfactory to another employer in the same line of business. The personal element plays a large part, and moreover experience teaches that such schemes cannot be adopted wholesale. They succeed best when they evolve from small beginnings, and the hands grow up with them, although, of course, the employer should have the principles of some definite scheme firmly fixed in his mind. Mr. Meakin deals in an eminently practical way with the various phenomena of the numerous schemes

[1] *Model Factories and Villages.* Ideal Conditions of Labour and Housing. By Budgett Meakin. With 209 Illustrations. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1906.

of which he gives examples. Under conditions of labour he discusses "social relations," "buildings," "work-rooms," "work," "meals," "recreation," "education," and administration; under "industrial housing," he describes model villages in France, Italy, Austria, Holland, America and England, and discusses generally the housing problem and the land question together with steps for their solution. To employers and employés alike and to all social reformers this work should prove invaluable.

Economic and Statistical Studies, 1840–1890,[1] by the late John Towne Danson, is a difficult book to appraise. It is prefaced by a memoir by his daughter and an introduction by Professor Gonner. The distinguishing feature of Mr. Danson's writings is their versatility. His breadth of view enabled him to deal with numerous subjects which had nothing in common, but which interested him because they related to the profession or business with which he happened at the moment to be pursuing. Thus, when assisting Lord Grey, he wrote on the Colonies; as a barrister, on some legal matters; as a farmer, on agricultural topics; as an underwriter, on marine insurance. It is this lack of concentration on one special subject which prevented Danson from leaving work of a more enduring character. But in spite of this weakness Danson's work fills up some gaps in economic thought. Written in many instances fifty to sixty years ago, they are even of more value to-day than when they were penned. On the problems of the conditions of the people and the housing question Danson was far in advance of his age. Economists will welcome especially the large number of diagrams and charts reproduced here. The pamphlet on the "Condition of the People with Relation to the Harvests" will prove of special interest in the Fiscal controversy. Danson's friends—and they must be numerous—will peruse with gratification the charmingly written memoir by his daughter.

Retaliatory Duties[2] by Professor Dietgel, translated by the Rev. D. W. Simon, D.D., and Mr. W. Osborne Brigstocke, is a welcome contribution to one branch of the Fiscal Question, which, in the turmoil of party conflict has not received the attention which it merits. Retaliation, *i.e.*, a fighting-duties policy or a policy of retort, was too often confused with the policy of reciprocity. Professor Dietgel clearly distinguishes there two variants of retaliation and carefully analyses each. Retaliation, or "hitting back," as Mr. Chamberlain phrases it, is not wrong in principle as many German and English economists hold. "Whether a

[1] *Economic and Statistical Studies, 1840-1890.* By John Towne Danson. With a Brief Memoir by his Daughter, Mary Norman Hill. And an Introduction by E. C. K. Gonner, M.A., Brunner Professor of Economic Science, Liverpool University. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1906.

[2] *Retaliatory Duties.* By H. Dietgel, Professor at the University of Bonn. Translated by D. W. Simon. D.D., and W. Osborne Brigstocke for the Unionist Free Trade Club. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1906.

manœuvre of fighting duties is justifiable or not cannot," says the Professor, "be settled on abstract principles, but only in concrete cases." Accordingly Professor Dietgel argues the case from actual experience. Does retaliation pay? The answer is scarcely ever. As a general rule it does more harm than good. Cases of retaliation without injury to the country employing it have no existence. Mr. Chamberlain and his fellow-retaliators will find chilly comfort from this valuable treatise.

The Garter Mission to Japan,[1] by Lord Redesdale, is a delightful record of the experiences of the little party which bore to the Emperor of "The Empire of the Rising Sun" the Order of the Garter, as a symbol of the alliance which had just been cemented between the two island powers of the East and of the West. Prince Arthur of Connaught was the bearer of the insignia with which with his own hand he invested the Emperor. As Lord Redesdale is careful to point out, this investiture is regarded in Japan not merely as a mark of friendship between two sovereigns, nor even the recognition of the genius of a Ruler who has raised his country from the obscurity of a hermit nation to the proud position she now occupies among the great Powers, but it was the symbol of the admiration for the genius, patriotism, and heroism of one people by another. No one could have been more happily chosen for the position of conductor of the Mission than Lord Redesdale, who, by his official residence in Japan, had become himself a *persona grata* to its leading men, and no one was more qualified to pen this record than the minister who remembered the pre-revolution days of 1868. As a graceful tribute to our new allies this book will receive a warm welcome in Japan, whilst to us it is a proof of the spontaneous expression of the feelings of gratification exhibited by all classes in Japan for the compliment paid to their beloved Emperor and to their own national genius.

The name of Charles Bradlaugh will ever be associated with one phase of the long struggle for liberty of thought against religious intolerance and bigotry. *Charles Bradlaugh: A Record of his Life and Work*,[2] by Mrs. Hypatia Bradlaugh Bonner, *With an Account of his Parliamentary Struggle, Politics and Teachings*, by Mr. John M. Robertson, M.P., has now reached the sixth edition, a tangible proof of the popularity of this joint work. The feature of the present edition is the story of the motion to expunge from the journals of the House of Commons the resolution for the exclusion of Bradlaugh from the House. Next to Mrs. Bonner, credit for this belated act of justice must be given to Mr. J. M. Robertson,

[1] *The Garter Mission to Japan.* By Lord Redesdale, G.C.V.O., K.C.B. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1906.

[2] *Charles Bradlaugh.* A Record of His Life and Work. By his Daughter, Hypatia Bradlaugh Bonner. With an Account of his Parliamentary Struggle, Politics, and Teachings, by John M. Robertson. Two Vols. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1906.

the late Mr. W. A. Hunter, and the late Mr. W. H. Smith, whose humanity conquered his religious and political bias. It seems strange that barely twenty years ago a member should have been expelled from the House of Commons because he refused to take an oath which was meaningless to him, and desired to make an affirmation which was binding on his conscience. The whole is a pithy commentary on the value of Christian ethics. This is a book which has taken its place in the bibliography of the history of liberty.

The rise of a great Power in the Far East and the momentous overthrow of Russia have produced far-reaching effects upon the political situation in Europe in all directions. France, for instance, has been constrained to find a new policy for her action in the East. In *Le Japon et la Politique Française*[1] M. Roger Dorient, a close observer at the pschological moment, has supplied us with the explanation of this stupendous turn in the wheel of fortune and the limits of Japan's ambition. After dealing with the causes of Japan's success, domestic and foreign, M. Dorient raises the questions of the threat to Indo-China, its capability of effective resistance, the sea-power and the foreign policy of France. To all these problems he supplies answers which are worthy of the close attention of all supporters of Greater France.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

In *Henry Sidgwick: a Memoir*,[2] the loving hands of A. S. and E. M. S. have rescued from oblivion the records of a quiet existence filled with multifarious intellectual interests. For forty years, viz., from 1859, when he graduated Senior Classic and thirty-third Wrangler, down to his death in 1890, the name of the late Professor of Moral Philosophy at Cambridge was honoured beyond the confines of University circles. His literary activity was marvellous, as the bibliography attached to his Memoir testifies. *Methods of Ethics* and *Principles of Political Economy* are among the works by which he is best known; but one of his earliest contributions to literature is the review of *Ecce Homo*, which appeared anonymously in the *Westminster Review* of July 1866. He had no sooner graduated than he threw with such ardour into the study

[1] *Le Japon et la Politique Française.* Par Roger Dorient. Paris: Plon-Nourrit et Cie. 1906.

[2] *Henry Sidgwick: a Memoir.* By A. S. and E. M. S. London: Macmillan and Co.

of first Arabic, afterwards of Hebrew, that it was generally thought that he aspired to become a second Ewald, under whom he studied for a while in Germany. Spiritualism and Psychical Research interested him greatly. Above all, he laboured ardently in the cause of the education of women in Cambridge. Newnham College, where his wife presided, was the home of his latter years. Professor Sidgwick had a fund of dry humour. "Henry, what are the people saying about my boy's book?" asked the late Archbishop Benson, alluding to *Dodo*. "They say, bishop," replied Sidgwick, "that you wrote it yourself." This anecdote is wanting in the Memoir before us; but even if it be not true, it is sufficiently characteristic of the man as to deserve quoting.

The principal object of *Reflections on some Leading Facts and Ideas of History*,[1] by Mr. C. W. Whish (late of the Indian Civil Service), is to "advocate the necessity of a succinct but comprehensive review of history as a whole as a preliminary to the study of any part of it." His conception of the value of history from the æsthetic and teleological standpoint is, in the main, identical with that of Friedrich Schiller, whose views are embodied in the Inaugural Address which he delivered, in 1789, on his appointment to the Chair of History at Jena. History, as conceived by Mr. Whish, is a very formidable subject, embracing astronomy and the whole range of subjects to which the Germans have given the name of *Erdkunde*. Opinions will necessarily be divided as to the adequacy of his broad divisions of Universal History; but students will find his chart very serviceable. His volume, which is undoubtedly the outcome of extensive reading and much thought, is more stimulative than conclusive. We hope his appeal to millionaires for a national historical library will not fall on deaf ears.

Général de Piépape, in *Le Coup de Grace*,[2] has given us a very full account of Bourbaki's campaign in the East of France, in the war of 1870, which ended in the retreat of the French army into Switzerland, and its internment there. It was one of the saddest episodes in that terrible year, and it ended in a desperate, though unsuccessful, attempt of the heart-broken Bourbaki to destroy himself. Général de Piépape has told his story with great fulness and, as far as we may judge, with great accuracy. What, however, pleases us most in his book is its feeling. He writes with the sadness natural in a defender of a lost cause; but he writes with a clearness and simplicity, and, above all, with a fairness towards his conquering foe, that are worthy of a good soldier. It is not too much to say that he deserves to be compared, as a military historian, with William Napier, and this is no slight praise. No Frenchman

[1] *Reflections on some Leading Facts and Ideas of History.* By C. W. Whish. Guildford: Billing & Sons.

[2] *Le Coup de Grace: Epilogue de la Guerre Franco-Allemande dans l'Est.* Par Général Piépape. Paris: Plon-Nourrit et Cie.

need feel shame in looking back on those months of defeat and suffering. On the other hand, he may take a Cato-like pride in the heroism with which that awful chastening was borne.

In M. Dry's *Soldats Ambassadeurs sous le Direction au IV. au VIII.*,[1] we have a valuable addition to the knowledge of the revolutionary age. The author has given us full and interesting sketches of Marshal Pérignon and Admiral Truguet, Ambassadors to Spain; General Aubert-Dubayet, Ambassador at Constantinople; Marshal Clarke, Envoy-Extraordinary to Austria; General Cauclaux, Minister-Plenipotentiary to Naples; General Lacombe Saint-Michel, Ambassador to Naples, and Marshal Bernadotte, Ambassador to Austria; and his exhaustive accounts of their respective missions are a mine which students of the four years of the Directorate will have to investigate. The number of military men appointed to diplomatic posts by the Directorate, and, after it, by Napoleon is very remarkable. This was doubtless due to the fact that, in the great crash, only in the services remained a considerable body of men accustomed to discipline and authority, and possessing something of the manner considered necessary in diplomacy. Thus, of the seven envoys named above, six had more or less claim to nobility sufficient, at least, to have qualified them for commissions under the *ancien régime;* while Bernadotte, the lowliest of them in point of birth, died a king. The mass of the officers were inclined by instinct to moderate views. They were at first Constitutional; after the fall of the monarchy they favoured the Girondists; and when the extreme men were at the height of their power, the soldiers were facing the enemies of their country. Then professional instinct also led them to side with the Executive rather than with the praters in the Councils. On the other hand, the Executive was glad to secure the support of the military chiefs, and to give them distant appointments or commands, either as a reward or as a means of getting rid of powerful rivals. M. Dry has thrown much light on the relations of the Army and the Government of the Republic.

In *The Discoverers and Explorers of America*,[2] a title contracted in the front page to *Heroes of Discovery in America*, Mr. Charles Morris deals directly and in a pleasant way with more than forty personages, from Leif the Lucky down to the most recent times. This excellently illustrated work on a fascinating subject appeals to a large public, and schoolmasters will do well to include it in their selection of prize-books.

The Canadian War of 1812,[3] by Mr. C. P. Lucas, is intended as an instalment of Canadian history. It is a subject which has

[1] *Soldats Ambassadeurs sous le Directoire an IV.-au VIII.* Par A. Dry. Paris: Plon-Nourrit et Cie.

[2] *The Discoverers and Explorers of America.* By Charles Morris. Philadelphia and London: J. B. Lippincott Company.

[3] *The Canadian War of 1812.* By C. P. Lucas, C.B. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

been very little studied in this country, and the few who are aware that there ever was such a war remember it on account of the fight between the *Shannon* and the *Chesapeake*, or the battle of New Orleans. The war itself was a comparatively minor affair, which only served to increase the bitterness between America and England while the latter country was engaged in crushing Napoleon. It demonstrated, however, the value of sea-power and the extraordinary difficulty, as we discovered in the late Boer War, of conquering a large territory. Mr. Lucas has utilised all available materials for the preparation of his exhaustive monograph, and six out of the eight maps which accompany the letter-press are contemporary American productions. Students will find all they can possibly require in this readable and carefully arranged account of the struggle which terminated in the treaty of Ghent (1814).

Under the much too modest title of *Guide to St. Olave's, Hart Street*,[1] Mr. B. Corcoran has published a very interesting collection of antiquarian lore about one of our oldest city parishes. The first authentic record of this church dates from 1283. It escaped the great fire of London, mainly through the activity and foresight of Pepys, who lived close by, and some of the monuments and parish records are of great historical interest. Part of the Roman City wall is visible in this parish, and other evidence of the Roman occupation is plentiful. In 1560 the first glass works in London were established here. The pamphlet contains numerous sketches of the church and its monuments by the author and an illustrated list of tradesmen's tokens of the seventeenth century, which were issued in the neighbourhood, will be of interest to numismatists. It would be well if all our city parishes could find as enthusiastic historians before their ancient buildings and monuments have been swept away by the wave of modernisation that is swamping London.

BELLES LETTRES.

In *Portraits and Jewels of Mary Stuart*,[2] Mr. Andrew Lang steers a middle course between the scepticism of M. Henri Bouchot, who only accepts four portraits as authentic, and the credulity too commonly displayed at loan exhibitions. Setting aside coins, posthumous memorial pictures, and the effigy on the Queen's tomb, Mr. Lang finds satisfactory proof of eighteen being contemporary and

[1] *Guide to St. Olave's, Hart Street, London.* By Bryan Corcoran. London: Blades. 1906.

[2] *Portraits and Jewels of Mary Stuart.* By Andrew Lang. Glasgow: James Maclehose & Sons.

authentic, or at least related closely to others which did possess these qualities. For the identification of the Levin and Melville portrait, which forms the frontispiece, the author relies much on the jewels, and rightly so, for the painters of the sixteenth century were minutely accurate in depicting princely ornaments. In 1815 Thomas Thomson published anonymously, *Inventories and Other Records of the Royal Wardrobe*, from MSS. in the General Register House of Edinburgh, and one in the Duke of Hamilton's muniment room; but fuller information on the subject is obtainable from Joseph Robertson's *Les Inventaires de la Boyne d'Escosse*. Mr. Lang is convinced, from a comparison of the jewels in the Inventories with those represented in the Levin and Melville portrait, that the latter, if not an original, probably painted in France about 1560, is a very good copy of it, and not an archæological reconstruction of the seventeenth century. Sixteen excellent illustrations adorn this latest and most instructive monograph on a subject of undying interest.

We have nothing but praise for Miss (?) Lilian Dalbiac's *Dictionary of Quotations (German)*,[1] with its English and German subject-indices. Without pretending to be exhaustive, this collection of judiciously chosen quotations is, far and away, the most complete that has yet appeared in this country or Germany. A commendable feature of it is that every quotation is followed by a version, for the most part, from a translator of recognised ability, such as, for instance, Sir Theodore Martin, G. Leland, E. B. Browning, Anna Swanwick, Bayard Taylor, Walter Sichel, and others too numerous to mention. We are glad to find that the claims of Heine as a prose writer here receive tardy but generous recognition.

Mr. Louis Becke may be credited with no less than seventeen stories, without counting several in which he has collaborated, and his latest, entitled *The Adventures of a Supercargo*,[2] has all the freshness of a first novel with the additional advantage of a mastery over his craft. Tom Denison, the hero of numerous exploits in the South Seas, has none of the bumptiousness and bloodthirstiness that characterise so disagreeably the majority of youths in fiction, who run away from home or school in quest of adventure. In fact, although possessing a distinct vocation for the sea, his career, so far as this story is concerned, is rather the result of accident than choice. Young people will doubtless look forward to hearing more of his adventures in a subsequent volume.

Lovers of frankly sensational fiction will not be disappointed in *The Marriage of Eileen*,[3] by Mr. H. Maxwell. The plot turns on the theft of certain plans, for which provisional protection had not

[1] *Dictionary of Quotations (German)*. By Lilian Dalbiac. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.
[2] *The Adventures of a Supercargo*. By Louis Becke. London: T. Fisher Unwin.
[3] *The Marriage of Eileen*. By H. Maxwell. London: Digby, Long & Co.

been obtained, of an invention which was to revolutionise the motor-car industry. Of the three villains, of whom two were aristocrats and one an exceedingly vulgar company promoter, it would be hard to name the worst. Poetic justice is, however, meted out impartially in the end. Baldrick's courtship of the two dear old maiden ladies, who pinch themselves in order to maintain their worthless nephew in luxury, is both humorous and pathetic.

A much felt want has been supplied by the *Business Blue-Book*,[1] compiled by experienced men, with a view to helping the thousands of men and women engaged in "business" who, unfortunately, lack the necessary knowledge of its theory and practice. Such a book ought to prove of practical service and have its place on every office bookshelf.

Two unpretentious looking little volumes of convenient size for the pocket will appeal for many reasons to the general public. In the *Pronouncing Dictionary of Mythology and Antiquity*,[2] interest has not been sacrified to conciseness in the description of heroes, gods, statesmen, artists, places, &c.

The Pronouncing Dictionary of Latin Quotations[3] is very useful, and contains a good alphabetical English index. In both books a special feature is the pronunciation of names, given in such a manner as to render mispronunciation well-nigh impossible, and the type is delightfully clear.

Messrs. Walker and Co. also publish a shilling Atlas, containing eighty physical and political maps, which they claim to be their "*Ideal*" *Atlas of the World*.[4]

[1] *The Business Blue-Book.* London: Curtis, Gardner & Co., Ltd.
[2] *Pronouncing Dictionary of Mythology and Antiquity.* London: J. Walker & Co.
[3] *Pronouncing Dictionary of Latin Quotations.* London: J. Walker & oC.
[4] *Walker's Ideal Atlas of the World.* London: J. Walker & Co.

THE

WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

VOL. CLXVI. No. 4.—OCTOBER 1906.

THE MONTH.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

The Premier's Great Loss.

ALL hearts go out in sympathy to Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman in the great loss he has sustained by the death of his wife. Lady Campbell-Bannerman was a true helpmeet to her husband, sharing in all his aspirations for the promotion of the common weal; and, undoubtedly, when the first dull agony of separation has passed away, her memory will inspire him to renewed and determined effort in the cause of truth and justice. Henry George has told us how when on a similar occasion John Bright was turning heart-stricken from a new-made grave Richard Cobden grasped him by the hand, saying, "Come with me. Women and children in this country are dying of hunger—of hunger made by the laws. Come with me, and we will not rest till we have repealed those laws." It was in this spirit that the fight against the Corn Laws was fought. That fight was successful, the Corn Laws were repealed; but, unfortunately, it is still true that "women and children in this country are dying of hunger—of hunger made by the laws," and no true man can rest till those laws are repealed. As Richard Cobden afterwards realised, the repeal of the Corn Laws was but the taking of one of the outworks of the great stronghold of Privilege, and the citadel, land monopoly, still remains to be assailed. It was for this reason, he declared "You who shall liberate the land will do more for your country than we have done in the liberation of its trade." It was for this reason he said that if he had been still a young man he would have taken Adam Smith in hand, and would have preached the liberation of the land

up and down the country. It was for this reason he demanded that the old 4*s*. Land Tax, then as now, levied on the values of 1692, should be levied on the full true yearly value of the land, saying "I hope to see societies formed calling upon the legislature to revalue the land and to put a taxation upon it in proportion to the needs of the State." And, undoubtedly, as Mrs. Cobden Unwin, the daughter of the great Free Trader, well said, if the liberation of the land had been properly taken in hand the recent fight against a resurrected Protectionism would not have had to be fought.

A Worthy Memorial.

It remains now to carry the fight to its logical conclusion, and towards this conclusion we trust our Premier will strenuously strive. While the fight was in progress Sir Henry lost no opportunity of pointing out that the taxation of land values for local and national purposes was the true alternative to Mr. Chamberlain's farcical and suicidal fiscal proposals. As the Premier has repeatedly pointed out, our present systems of rating and land tenure constitute a greater drain upon trade and industry, and a greater menace to the standard of life of our people, than any foreign tariffs. As the late Cardinal Manning eloquently phrased it, "The land question means hunger, thirst, and nakedness, notice to quit, labour spent in vain, the toil of years seized upon, the breaking up of homes, the misery, sickness, deaths of parents, children, wives, the despair and wildness which spring up in the hearts of the poor, when legal force, like a sharp harrow, goes over the most sensitive and vital rights of mankind. All this is contained in the land question." And the solution of the land question means the righting of all these wrongs. The Premier himself has said that the housing problem and the unemployed problem are but phases of the great land question. We trust that he will ere long take the first step towards the solution of this question. By so doing he will enshrine his memory, and that of Lady Campbell-Bannerman also, in the hearts of the people of this country for ever.

Britain's Abraham Lincoln.

To be effective, however, the first step must be a big step—a step really worth while. As John Stuart Mill has told us, "when the aim is to raise the permanent condition of a people, small means do not merely produce small effects, they produce no effect at all." But, were Cobden's advice followed, were the old Land Tax levied on the values of to-day instead of on those of more than 200 years ago, it would, as we have frequently shown, yield a revenue sufficient to allow of the payment of members and of election expenses, the repeal of all remaining taxes on food, and the establishment of old age pensions,

while by forcing idle land into use it would solve the housing problem and provide ample work for all idle hands. These reforms could be carried, and should be carried, in next year's Budget in the teeth of the House of Lords, and in addition a Bill should be passed enabling all local authorities, whether in town or country, to untax the homes and the trade and industry of the people and to derive all local revenues from land values. Abraham Lincoln is revered as the President who freed from chattel slavery the negro slaves of the Southern States of America. If he carries out the reforms outlined above, Sir Henry will be revered as the Premier who freed his fellow-countrymen from a worse than chattel slavery.

Repatriate Lord Selborne!

ALREADY in his efforts to put an end to yellow slavery in South Africa, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannermann has been engaged in work very similar to that of Abraham Lincoln; but, unhappily, those efforts have been largely nullified by the action of "the men on the spot." A Johannesburg correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, telegraphs under date September 7, that he is informed that the policy of the Home Government regarding the recruiting of natives on the East Coast of Africa for the Robinson group of mines has been frustrated, only one licence having been granted to a Robinson agent, whereas licences are required for a number of recruiting agents. The Robinson recruiting agency consequently can do nothing. "The policy of the Home Government," he points out, "is thus subverted, and another instance is afforded of how it is brought into contempt by the local Administrations frustrating its intentions. The officials of the Chamber of Mines boast that this has been done." Nothing more, he tells us, has been heard of Mr. Cresswell's white labour experiment in one of the Robinson mines, and "the statement made by Mr. Churchill in his speech announcing the Constitution . . . seems resultless, further indicating the control of the Chamber of Mines." Again, "The Transvaal Government this week refused Mr. Hull in the Legislative Council information bearing on the result of the employment of Chinese. . . . Mr. Hull moved a resolution that the information should be supplied, but it was defeated by the officials. All the non-officials with one exception voted for the resolution." Well may the *Guardian's* correspondent declare that "the antagonism of the Administration to the policy of the Home Government and to local popular desires is a serious matter." This antagonism must be removed by the removal of the antagonistic elements. We may trust the people of the Transvaal to use their votes very effectively to this end wherever possible, for they are hardly likely to be deceived by the pretended acquiescence of the Rand magnates

in the repatriation of their yellow serfs. But even when all has been done that votes can do, the obstructionist-in-chief, the High Commissioner himself, will remain; and therefore we reiterate our demand that Lord Selborne, the "pro-pigtail" appointee of a "pro-pigtail" Government, shall himself be repatriated.

For £30,000,000, £1,250,000!

As Mr. Winston Churchill intimated, the Transvaal contribution of £30,000,000 towards the cost of the feather in Mr. Chamberlain's cap has gone. Even the first £10,000,000 guaranteed by the Rand magnates has dwindled to £4,000,000, and of these four millions only the one million and a quarter to be devoted to the part settlement of claims based on military receipts declared by Mr. Chamberlain to be as good as Bank of England notes, can be considered as a contribution towards the cost of war! As for the balance of the four millions, £1,500,000 is earmarked for land settlement, £1,000,000 for a Transvaal Land Bank in connection with the land settlement scheme, and £250,000 for Sanna's Post Railway in the Orange River Colony. Of course, Mr. Chamberlain's "bargain" with the mine-owners, on the strength of which this country guaranteed a development loan of £35,000,000, was a sheer absurdity; and, as the *Volkstem* says, "no serious South African regards the promise to pay £30,000,000 as other than an historical curiosity." But surely the Randlords might have been "kept up to the scratch" in regard to the £10,000,000 they had guaranteed; and if they would not respond willingly, a tax on Rand values, and upon other land values held by these monopolists, would not only have provided "the needful," but would also have done much to facilitate land settlement, and to solve the ever-acute housing problem of the Rand. We may add that the *Volkstem*, which very evidently voices the opinions of the Boer leaders in respect to the loan, declares that "while it is the manifest duty of the British military authorities to honour its officers' receipts, it is not the duty of the taxpayer of the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony"; that "the war debt obligation is detestable and onerous"; and that "a reopening of the question of compensation cannot be prevented by the grant of £1,250,000 to meet hard cases."[1]

The Labour Outlook.

The Trades Union Congress, which met at Liverpool this year, was attended by 491 delegates, representing 1,554,000 trade unionists. The President (Mr. D. C. Cummings, General Secretary of the Boiler-Makers' and Steamship Builders' Association, Newcastle-on-Tyne), referring in his opening address to "what has been termed the sudden advent

[1] *Tribune*, September 5.

of a Labour Party in the political life of the nation," said that "it was not a surprise to those who had been working for years to bring it about," and that "the success of Labour candidates was for them as trade unionists the one outstanding feature of the late General Election, and should give the Congress great cause for rejoicing. Perhaps next in importance (he added) was the satisfaction they rightly felt that a Government was returned numbering amongst its ranks many friends of labour, whom they rightly expected to shortly prove that they stand for more righteous dealing than did those who held the citadel for so many years, when progress, if not dead, was fast asleep, and cruel war held sway." He deprecated any talk about "two Labour Parties," and, declaring that "unity is strength in Labour politics just as it is in trade unionism," he warned would-be mischief-makers that "the growing hosts of workers, awakening to their real needs and rights, will brook no petty squabbles or personal selfishness, and will send to the right-about men who put their own personal antipathies before the work of the emancipation of labour." Referring to the work of the past Session, he said "they must all feel glad that the Government got early to work in the direction they, as trade unionists, desired, by the introduction of a Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, and also the Trades Disputes Bill." The former, he remarked, had required strengthening, and that "the Labour members in Committee had succeeded in doing in several directions." The Government Trades Disputes Bill, as first introduced, was "a great disappointment," but "the defect of the Bill had been to some extent remedied." Trade unionists, however, were "determined to fight on until their position was just as unassailable by employers as employers' federations were unassailable by the financial assaults of trade unions. They would not be content with a paper equality, but demanded an equality that was actual and real."

A Blind Leader of the Blind.

But in dealing with "the growing evil of unemployment," Mr. Cummings showed much less grasp of the position. He seems, indeed, to regard improvements in methods and in machinery, and the long hours of labour of those in work, as the chief causes of unemployment. "The continuous increase of improvement in machinery, aided by science and increased mechanical skill, is," he said, "gradually but surely making all production easier and less costly. Year by year the amount of actual working time required for the worker to produce a given article is becoming less and less. As the hours of labour for a working day or week remain as formerly, the number of unemployed increases, and the actual employment of those employed becomes of a more casual character, resulting in the yearly income of the workers showing a decrease at a time when

the aggregate trade of the country is on the increase." As if, forsooth, the wants of the nation are completely satisfied by the product of the number of hours now worked. As if, forsooth, the number of hours of labour required is strictly limited, and the only way to secure work for all is to share out between all applicants the total number of hours of labour so required! So long as a single human want remains unsatisfied there is work to be done. But before he can work, the worker must have a foothold in space; and his only foothold is the land. Before he can work, the worker must have raw material to work upon; and the only storehouse of that raw material is, again, the land. Land and labour, indeed, are the only two essential factors in wealth production. And there is land in plenty all around. If, therefore, men willing and able to work are forced to stand idle, while they, their wives, and their children are suffering for lack of the necessaries and the comforts of life their labour can provide, it can only be because the land, the raw material lacking which labour is powerless to produce, is by unjust laws denied to them. Mr. Cummings seems to have caught a glimpse of this vital and fundamental relation between land and labour when he says: "The causes of unemployment are many, being individual as well as collective; but they can be traced to land being held for private use or abuse, and science, with all other easy methods of production, being used to benefit the few as against the interests of the many." But he should have stopped short at "abuse," for the fact that all improvements in machinery and methods tend to benefit the few instead of the many can itself "be traced to land being held for private use or abuse." "The cures of unemployment are also manifold," continued Mr. Cummings, "for the effects have to be dealt with as well as the causes. In addition to the employable, the loafer, the criminal, and the unemployable, many of whom are the direct products of idleness and unjust social conditions, also need attention." There are doubtless secondary causes of unemployment, but the root cause, the primary cause, is land monopoly. And until that primary cause is removed, no other remedies, however good and desirable in themselves, can solve the problem of unemployment. This the leaders of the Labour movement must learn if they would not be mere blind leaders of the blind.

Overtime, Unemployment, and Sweating.

After the President's speech, it was not surprising to find the Congress adopting a resolution calling for "the limitation of systematic overtime," a step which it was urged, "would do a great deal to solve the unemployed question." The mover of the resolution (Mr. W. Mosses, of the Pattern Makers' Society, Leeds) went so far, indeed, as to denounce systematic overtime as

"one of the greatest curses of the present industrial system," and declared that "with men working so much overtime it was sheer hypocrisy to ask for an eight-hours day." The Congress also "placed on record its strongest protest against, and condemnation of, the pernicious system of 'time cribbing,'" and, with a view to putting a stop to this and other infringements of the Factory Acts, the delegates actually "called upon the Government to pass a law giving such power to the police as will enable them to act as aids to his Majesty's Inspectors of Factories." To such lengths are even hard-headed trade unionists carried by the delusion that the evils caused by restrictive land laws are to be cured by piling up further restrictions rather than by getting rid of the restrictions that already exist, and are really the cause of all the trouble. It was, of course, only to be expected that the resolution on the Mines Regulation Act Amendment Bill should call for an eight-hours day for all colliery enginemen, boilermen, and stokers engaged above or below ground. But to suggest a "trade union label" as a remedy for sweating savours somewhat of prescribing a pill for an earthquake. Another resolution asked that the "Fair Wages Resolution of 1891" should be amended by the substitution of the words "trade union rate" for the words "current rate;" and "to prevent sweating and the evasion of the fair wages clause on binding and printing contracts for his Majesty's Stationery Office," the Congress urged, not that the fair wages clause of the printing contracts should be made more binding, but "that the binding and printing for his Majesty's Government should be executed by the Government itself in its own workshops under trade union wages and conditions." In spite, too, of the fact that "minimum wage" legislation can do nothing for labour in view of the landlord's power to insist upon a maximum rent, a resolution was passed declaring that "this Congress is of opinion that the establishment of a national minimum wage is necessary for the protection of all workers against the evils of sweating, and further calls upon the Labour members to press forward this proposal in the House of Commons in the next Session of Parliament."

Land, Housing, Pensions, &c.

THE land question was dismissed in a vague resolution instructing the Parliamentary Committee "to prepare a Bill for introduction to Parliament calling for a reform of the land laws." In regard to housing, the Congress contented itself with endorsing Mr. Steadman's Bill for the Housing of the Working-classes, and "calling for the provision of cheaper and better services of workmen's trains," and also protested against "the brutal and unjust action of certain employers in evicting workers from their homes during strikes or lock-outs." The Labour group in Parliament was desired to intro-

duce a Bill for the nationalisation of railroads, canals, mines, and minerals in the United Kingdom; and a further resolution declared in favour of old age pensions of 5*s.* per week for every person over the age of 60, "the entire cost of the scheme to be contributed by Imperial taxation," but no suggestion was offered as to the source or sources from which the necessary revenue should be derived. Other resolutions demanded State insurance in connection with the Workmen's Compensation Act, and declared "that no Trades Disputes Bill will be satisfactory that does not secure what was understood as the ante-Taff Vale position, on the basis of the complete immunity of the funds of trade unions from litigation;" and a resolution, to which it is to be hoped his Majesty's Government will very shortly give effect, was that which declared in favour of "compulsorily carrying private members measures over from stage to stage and Session to Session until either placed on the Statute Book or rejected, the only exception to be a dissolution of Parliament."

Peace, Conscription, and the Duma.

On the motion of Mr. John Ward, M.P., a resolution was passed supporting the principle of international arbitration, and strongly condemning "the insidious attempts to introduce into this country conscription, or any form of forced military service." The Congress further resolved to join in the deputation to Russia to present a memorial to the members of the Duma, and the President (Mr. Cummings) and the Secretary (Mr. W. Steadman, M.P.) were appointed for the purpose. The memorial is a very representative one, having been signed by three hundred members of Parliament, and by the officials of the leading trade unions, trade councils, and co-operative societies, and shows how deeply the people of this country sympathise with the democracy of Russia in its life and death struggle against autocracy and bureaucracy.

Comic Relief.

The proceedings of the Congress partook of tragi-comedy, but a little comic relief was afforded by a "demonstration" held in the Hope Hall, Liverpool, by the local branch of the Trade Unionist Tariff Reform Association. The "demonstration," which had been organised in view of the Trade Union Congress, merely demonstrated the weakness of the movement. "Of the 491 delegates attending the Congress," says the *Manchester Guardian*,[1] "there may have been half a dozen present, though the secretary of the Association recognised with certainty only two," and "local tariff reformers half filled the body of the hall." The chairman (Mr. F. Hastings Medhurst, President of the Association), "claimed that the members of the Association were as enthusiastic in their support of trade unionism as anybody could

[1] September 8.

be." He recognised that "their views on tariff reform were not held by the majority of trade unionists, but they were determined to convert their minority into a majority if it were possible." "A good many people," he asseverated, "opposed tariff reform because they thought it would strengthen trade unions. He hoped it would. He admitted that the average wage paid in France and Germany was less than the average in this country. But that (he argued) had nothing to do with the fiscal system adopted by those countries. Protection of itself could not raise wages—anybody who said it could was a fool [1]—but in a country whose workmen were organised and had full liberty it would produce a state of things which would enable them to claim a fair proportion of the profits they made." Perhaps Mr. Hastings Medhurst will explain how it is that trade unions are so much stronger in free trade England than in protected America, and how it is that the trust-ridden American worker fails to secure "a fair proportion of the profits he makes." Perhaps—perhaps not! Resolutions of the usual type were adopted. The first recognised "that unemployment is largely due to our present fiscal system," which is quite true, inasmuch as it is due to our taxing the trade and industry and the homes of the people instead of taxing land values, but went on to pledge those present to work for a revision of that system on the lines laid down by Mr. Chamberlain—that is to say, on lines that are utterly and hopelessly wrong. The second resolution was an expression of regret that, while deploring the importation of aliens into this country during trade disputes, the Trades Union Congress had not recognised "what is more disastrous to the workers—the free and unrestricted importation of the same aliens' products."

Trade still Booming.

By a strange fatality there appeared on the same page of the *Guardian* the Board of Trade returns for August and the eight months ending August 31. These returns show that our foreign trade, and especially our export trade, is still booming, the imports for the month having increased by £2,031,633 as compared with the imports for August of the previous year, while exports for the month had increased by £3,974,778. The imports amounted to £48,894,624 and the exports to £33,492,614. As in the case, too, of the previous months of this record-breaking year, the increase of exports is greatest in the case of manufactured articles, which are valued at £3,246,339 more than the similar exports for August, 1905. Iron and steel are still "going"—going strong!—the exports having increased by £940,752; whilst amongst other "threatened" industries we may note that our exports of machinery have increased by £303,163, those of cotton fabrics by £853,292, and those of

[1] What a number of such fools were loose at the General Election!

woollen fabrics by £315,384. During the first eight months of the year our imports totalled £398,009,524 as against £364,692,457 for the first eight months of 1905—an increase of no less than £33,317,067; while our exports of British and Irish produce and manufactures aggregated £247,529,092 as against £213,045,108—or an increase of £34,483,984; and our *entrepôt* trade—£57,402,347—showed an increase of £5,146,940. So long as our trade continues to expand by such leaps and bounds, Protection has no chance whatever. But slack times must come, and in the meantime we must press on with the work of freeing our trade and industry from the monopolies and restrictions and robber rates and taxes that still hamper them; for it is very certain that unless we do so—unless, for instance, "the liberation of the land" be "properly taken in hand"—at the first touch of hard times we shall once more have to fight the resurrected and re-galvanised fallacies of Protectionism.

Protection being Found Out.

Meanwhile in our colonies and in the United States of America, it is being more and more realised that Protection is a fraud. The Tariff Commissioners of Canada wish to increase the trade with this country by means of preferential tariffs, "but how far this can be accomplished without a helping hand from the mother country it is difficult to say." And at the same time, we learn, "the Canadian Farmers' Association has resolved to join with representatives of the Labour Congress in asking the Dominion Government to so amend the Canadian Tariff as to abolish all the protective elements, which, it is contended, operate too exclusively to the benefit of certain manufacturers and to the disadvantage of agriculturists." In Australia, Sir William Lyne is attempting to meet similar criticisms and to disarm the country folk by introducing bounties on cocoa beans, coffee beans, raw cotton, certain other fibres, milk, rice, and rubber. But it is significant that the Labour Party, at one time almost wholly Protectionist, is now so honeycombed with Free Trade ideas that it has decided to "sink the fiscal issue" and to give first place in its programme at the forthcoming election to a drastic graduated land tax aimed against the large estates, the *latifundia*, which are ruining Australia, as, according to Pliny, they ruined the Roman Empire. Mr. Newton J. Moore, the premier of West Australia, has also introduced in the State Parliament, with the express object of breaking down land monopoly, a tax of 1*d.* in the £ on the capital value of all land, increased to 2d. in the £ in "undeserving cases," in which the value of the improvements is less than half the value of the land. In America the Democratic Presidential campaign will resolve itself into a fight against the "Trusts," and therefore into a fight against Protection and against land monopoly. It is true that Mr. W. J.

Bryan, the most probable, if not the only possible, Democratic nominee for the Presidency, fails to understand the vital and fundamental character of the land question; but if he is to win, and if, in the event of victory, he is to turn his victory to the best account, he must learn. That he can learn, and that he will learn right speedily, we do not doubt.

"The Jungle" and the Way Out.

"I FAILED in my purpose in writing *The Jungle*," says Upton Sinclair, in *M.A.P.* "I wished to frighten the country by a picture of what its industrial masters were doing to their wage-slaves. I stumbled on another discovery—what they were doing to the meat supply. In other words, I aimed at the public's heart, and by accident I hit it in the stomach!" Mr. Upton Sinclair may yet find that to hit the nation's stomach is the surest way to the nation's heart. His book may well do for the Anti-Trust movement what *Uncle Tom's Cabin* did for the Abolition movement. It is very certain, at all events, that it will provide very effective "powder and shot" for Mr. Bryan's campaign. It may be that Mr. Bryan will hold, with the writer of an article on "The Gospel of Labour," in the *Christian World* of July 26 last, that "it is not a land question that has produced the state of things in Chicago described in *The Jungle*," but, to those who have eyes to see, it is very clear that the economic tyranny exercised by the Beef Trust rests, like the economic tyranny of the Randlords and of Lord Penrhyn, like the economic tyranny of the Coal Trust, the Standard Oil Trust, and the Steel Trust, upon land monopoly. Those who own the earth own "the base of supplies" of the whole industrial army, and, controlling the base of supplies, they have the industrial forces of the world at their mercy. This is the root cause of industrial slavery, whether in field, factory, mine, or workshop, and unless and until land monopoly is broken down, it is impossible to make the workers economically independent. What man or woman able to employ himself or herself on the land, and make an easy and an honest living, would submit to the unspeakable conditions of labour that obtain in the Chicago canned meat factories, or would be a party to the disgusting and gruesome frauds perpetrated by the Beef Trust upon the public? Free the land and you free the people. There is no other way.

£300,000,000 a Year for the Trusts.

THAT the fight against the Trusts will be a stern fight may be gauged from the fact that, according to a circular issued by the New York Reform Club, reliable estimates reveal that the American people are compelled by the protective tariff to pay 1,500,000,000 dollars—£300,000,000—more per year than the Government *gets* from the tariff. And the bulk of this vast sum, says the

circular, is "graft for the benefit of the Trusts and other protected interests." The Trusts and the interests will fight to the last ditch for the tariff that secures to them such huge dishonest gains, and therefore it behoves Mr. Bryan to see to it that he is fully prepared for the fray. If he fails to study and to understand the land question, he will be going into the fight with one arm tied behind his back. But Tom L. Johnson, the millionaire single-tax mayor of Cleveland, Ohio, and one of Mr. Bryan's keenest and strongest supporters, will doubtless see to it that no such fatal mistake is made.

Justice for Ireland.

The sins of the late Tory Government are finding them out. In the three-cornered duel between Mr. Walter Long, Mr. George Wyndham, and Sir Antony MacDonnell, the last-named has scored heavily, and each of the others must be "sorry he spoke." A measure of devolution, co-ordinating the various Irish Boards by means of an elective council and preparing the way for complete Home Rule, is foreshadowed for next Session; and not only did the late Government give their case away by their flirtation with devolution, but by their Land Purchase Act they took much of the "devil" out of the landlord opposition to Home Rule. Mr. Wyndham, indeed, boldly prophesies that the Unionists and the Irish Nationalists will both strive, and not in vain, to wreck the proposed scheme, and that the result will be the final triumph of Unionism, but he is merely "whistling to keep his courage up." Ireland has waited long for justice. She may have to be content with justice "on the instalment system," as Mr. Chamberlain sneeringly put it. But have justice she must and shall. Humanly speaking, nothing can now prevent it.

The Russian Revolution.

"For the last two years the revolutionary movement has attained an extraordinary force, and has grown particularly since the spring of the year. Hardly a day passes without some fresh outrage. Armed risings and mutinies at Sevastopol, Sveaborg, Reval, and Kronstadt, assassinations of officials and policemen, together with murder and rapine, have been going on uninterruptedly throughout the summer of 1906. Admiral Chuknin, commandant of the Black Sea Fleet; General Block, Governor of Samara; General Wanlialiarsky, Governor General of Warsaw; General Markgrafsky, and General Minn have all been murdered, and, in addition, many horrible outrages involving numbers of victims have been perpetrated, as, for example, the rebellion at Sevastopol directed against General Neplueff, commander of the fortress, and the attempt on the Premier. Moreover the police suffer enormous losses daily." In these pregnant sentences an official *communiqué*, issued by the Russian Government early in

September, summarises the leading features, from the Government point of view, of the present position in Russia. We are told in effect that the Duma was dissolved because "the revolutionaries, even before the dissolution of the Duma, were preparing on the one hand a rising of the army and navy, and on the other hand a general agrarian movement which was to overwhelm the country in disaster," and "the revolutionary movement must have been supported by the extremists who managed to get elected to the Duma, and who directed their efforts to usurping the executive power and to transforming the Duma into a constituent assembly."

"Deeds not Words."

M. STOLYPINE, in spite of the attempt on his life, which resulted in maiming his son and daughter and in many deaths, remains at the helm of State, and in the manifesto above referred to declares that "the aims of the Government are not to be altered because of criminal schemes. This or that person may be killed, but it is impossible to crush the Government's intention to restore the means of living and working freely." The policy of the Government is "to maintain order and to protect the people from the excesses of the revolutionaries by decisive measures, at the same time directing all the efforts of the State towards establishing a new *régime*, based upon law and reasonable liberty." Chief among the promised measures of reform is one for the extension of peasant holdings to which some 11,000,000 acres of Crown lands are to be devoted. But while repressive measures are carried out with a stern and ready hand, ameliorative measures are long delayed. Promises in the past have been made only to be broken, and both Press and people now clamour for "deeds not words." The only safe way out is for the Government to call the Duma together again at once, to grant, frankly and fully, constitutional government, and to give every facility for the prompt carrying out of measures to satisfy the land hunger of the peasants, and to secure civil, religious, political, and economic freedom for all. The bureaucracy can no longer count on the army and the navy. Even the Cossacks are failing them! General Garff, Deputy Chief of the Central Administration of the Cossack troops, has declared that the employment of the Cossacks as police cannot be justified, owing to the demoralising effect it produced on them, and that 30,000 Cossacks are now being disbanded.[1]

[1] *Times* telegram September 8.

THE FORMATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION COURT.

In a previous article in the Westminster Review, I advanced an argument in advocacy of the thorough acceptance by the civilised nations of the principle of settling all affairs of difference by appeal to a judicial authority. By this measure alone, it was affirmed, can the great European States get substantial and permanent relief from military burdens which press on them so heavily. That the nations ought to settle all their differences by appeal to justice, could they appeal to an absolutely reliable authority, every rational man must allow. But apart from considerations of abstract right, the practical success of resort to arbitration for the settlement of differences between nations must depend on the nature of the judicial authority; and as the constitution of an absolutely just and reliable authority is beyond our power, persons who will grant the foregoing claim, as a matter of abstract right, will say that from this circumstance the proposed method is impracticable. They argue that we could not make an authority of that standard of reliability and justness which is absolutely necessary for its practical success. It is, indeed, a fact that needs to be fully realised, that the character of the judicial authority is a matter of vital importance. The degree in which the nations will commit themselves to arbitration will depend on their confidence in the Arbitration Court. The present purpose is to develop the features in the formation of an International Arbitration Court briefly outlined in the article referred to.

The Arbitration Court formed at the Hague in 1899 has a list of arbitrators, four being nominated by each of the twenty-four signatory States. The procedure is that the States which wish to appeal to it shall each select two from this list, and the four thus selected shall appoint another from the list as umpire; or, if they cannot agree in this, the election of the umpire shall be left to the representatives of chosen neutral States. One matter of supreme importance in connection with an International Arbitration Court is that it should be free from partiality and from suspicion of partiality. What should be aimed at is an authority with no leaning toward, or particular connection with, any side, but shaped to measure out strictest justice, as nearly as human intelligence

can do it. Is it not obvious that the selection of the men who are to act as judges in such a Court should be made when the nations concerned have this purpose in view only? If the selection be left till a dispute arises, is it not nearly impossible that the selecting parties can escape being influenced by a desire to choose men who may be most favourably inclined to their side, and likely to see the affair in dispute from their own point of view? It is not only the possibility it gives of elements of partiality being brought into the Court that renders this method unsatisfactory: the knowledge that their opponents will have the election of some of the arbitrators, and the suspicion that their choice will be influenced by selfish considerations, will tend to dispose nations to distrust the Court. Side, of which there ought not to be even a suspicion, is very obvious in the Court at the Hague. Of the five arbitrators, two represent one side and two the other. And the selecting of the fifth as umpire again implies side: there are two contending parties, and he is to determine between them. The standing of the arbitrators on the list is that of judges, not of advocates, but this manner of election seems to imply a certain trust by the contending nations that the men they elect will watch their respective interests; and there seems to be reason to doubt whether the arbitrators, consciously or unconsciously, can be entirely free from this impression.

This manner of constitution is very far from being satisfactory; and to ignore this defect, or to attempt to belittle its importance, is not wise. A body of such supreme importance as an International Arbitration Court, on the reliability of which must depend the relief of the civilised nations from the scourge of war, and from the pressure of their great armaments, is not one to be made up hastily, nor to be regarded as satisfactory if in any degree defective. It ought to have the most careful study in order that it may be brought to the highest state of efficiency. Instead of their election being left till a difference rises, when the nations interested may be biased by their respective views of the affair, the judges ought to be definitely elected at the formation of the Court, when the nations and their representatives are free from party feeling, and have in view solely the purpose of forming a judicial authority which shall be as near to perfection as human faculty can make it. It is desirable to have every judicial authority quite independent of possible appellants. This is the case with our Courts of Justice. Men have confidence in these tribunals because they know the judges are independent and disinterested parties, to whom the disputants are seldom known, and from whom, therefore, an impartial judgment may be expected. It is evident, however, that an International Arbitration Court cannot stand in the same relation to the nations as do Courts of Justice to individual citizens.

Individuals find tribunals provided for them by governing authorities. But no corresponding authority exists to provide a tribunal for the nations. Their Court must be formed by themselves. The most satisfactory method appears to be for each nation concerned to select one arbitrator; and it might be well to require for the confirmation of the election of each, the expressed approval of all the other nations. By this method each nation, besides directly electing one, would have the power to prevent the election of any arbitrator whom it might think unfit.

It is well provided in the constitution of the court at the Hague, that each State must certify the four arbitrators whom it places on the list to be "d'une competence reconnue dans les questions de droit international, jouissants de la plus haute consideration morale et disposées à accepter les fonctions d'arbitres." Would it not be an improvement on this, to require each nation to be pledged to select a man with the single purpose of securing the character and ability which are necessary to fit one for the office of arbitrator? One of the principal reasons for the mistrust of arbitration, is the traditional regard of other nations, or certain other nations, as being unfriendly or hostile, and the belief that the men elected by these nations to the Arbitration Court would share this supposed hostility. Therefore all that is possible should be done to allay this mistrust. The men elected to the International Arbitration Court ought to be raised above all national prejudices and interests. They should stand not for national interests, but for world-interests. They should be given a new status; and it should be given definitely and emphatically. It should be agreed that they shall renounce the special claim which their respective nations have on them, and that from the time of their election, their bond and obligation shall be to all the contracting States alike. Each should be required to make a solemn pledge to free himself from the influence of party interests, and to make the promoting of the wellbeing of the nations, by the wise and impartial conduct of the Court, his single purpose.

The upholding of the Court's authority is a matter of importance. By the constitution of the Court at the Hague, nations who resort to it must undertake in a preliminary agreement to submit to its award. There is nothing further to bind them. This cannot be regarded as a satisfactory arrangement. The Court's authority ought to be upheld. Besides agreeing to abide by its awards, the contracting States ought also to bind themselves to maintain its authority. This may be objected to on the ground that it would be using force for the support of justice. The cause of arbitration, however, is not based on opposition to the use of force in itself, but on opposition to its unjust use. And it must be kept in mind that attaching to the Court would be a purely voluntary

act; no nation would be compelled to join. The Court must be respected. To allow any of its decisions to be disregarded would be fatal to its influence. Therefore the nations concerned ought to bind themselves to uphold its decisions by force if necessary. In doing this they would pledge their earnestness. They would show that they had not formed an Arbitration Court to fool with it; that having decided to settle their affairs of difference by appeal to justice, they intended to support justice.

Another question of importance is that of language. The Arbitration Court would be formed by nations speaking different tongues. The arbitrators ought to be able to readily communicate their thoughts to each other; and it is desirable that all the nations should be able to read their awards. The Court should have an official language—one that can be acquired without difficulty by the nations interested. The idea readily occurs, that one of the languages now most in use among the nations might be selected. But it is very unlikely that all the nations would agree to this, as it would give a pre-eminence to the people whose language should be chosen which would be objectionable to others. Another idea is that a neutral language might be adopted. As the result of the labour of Dr. Zamenhof, who was inspired by the thought of the benefit of a good key-language to the world, a new language has come to the notice of the peoples during recent years. Esperanto has been taken up with enthusiasm in many countries. It is already used by many to communicate with people of different tongue, and there is a consensus of opinion as to its good qualities. Why should not Esperanto be adopted as the language of the nation's Arbitration Court? It could not be objected to on the ground that it would favour any nation. The adoption for the Arbitration Court of a good auxiliary language would be a further benefit to the world, in that it would tend to bring such language into general use, and so lead the nations to a better knowledge of each other, than which nothing is more likely to check militarism.

The Court should be bound to give a decision on every case placed with it. It should be formed with an odd number of arbitrators, and if in any case they should not agree, the award of the majority should stand. The contracting States should agree to acknowledge and maintain the present territorial position of each. The sole function of the Court, it should be made clear, would be to give awards in affairs submitted to it. It would have no control of the internal affairs of any nation. It should also be stated that the standing of the Court would be that of an instrument of the contracting nations, subject to their regulation, and liable to accept for its guidance such laws as the nations may agree to from time

to time. The cost of the Court, of course, should be borne in equal parts by the contracting States.

The question of which nations shall have a part in the formation and control of such an Arbitration Court is one of first importance. In the case of the Court formed at the last Hague Conference, the standing of all the States which sent representatives is alike. But the question of control is of much less importance with a Court of that character than in regard to one with fixed judges. Why should there be a thought of exclusion? it will be asked. Are we not striving to attain justice? And would not exclusion be an injustice? Why not then allow every State that may desire it to join in the scheme? It has to be said in answer, that there are good reasons why this should not be allowed. What is the source of the anti-military movement of our day? It is an abnormal development of militarism in certain great nations, along with a moral development which brings the more intellectual part of the people more and more in opposition to militarism. It is, therefore, a question in which these nations are primarily concerned. The other nations are concerned only indirectly. It is essential to the success of a thorough scheme of arbitration that the nations concerned should have confidence in the Court, and they can have confidence in it only by controlling it. The question being one that belongs particularly to the great nations, they should control the Court, and control from any source which would weaken their confidence in it is to be deprecated. Is it reasonable that the peoples of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg and the Principality of Montenegro, each equal in number to a second rate English town, merely because they still exist as independent States, should have a part in the control of the Court equal to that of an Empire stretching round the world? If petty States like these were allowed to elect arbitrators, and States in such a stage of development as, for instance, Persia, would it not lessen the confidence of the great nations in the Court's ability to deal wisely with any complicated problem that may arise between them? It could not be otherwise. That being so, the Court should be in no degree subject to their control.

There is another reason for distinguishing between the nations. The anti-military movement rises from particular nations which have attained a certain moral development. There is within these nations an abiding moral force impelling them in this direction. It is this that proves the fitness of these nations to take a part in the formation of an International Arbitration Court. It is with a scheme of this kind as it is with political institutions and forms of government: success depends on the stage of development of its constituents. As a democratic form of government would fail with a people who could not take an

intelligent and active part in political affairs, so is the success of a scheme for the settlement of differences between nations by appeal to a judicial authority dependent on the intellectual and moral development of its constituent nations. States whose people have not reached this stage of development, which are not possessed of the moral force which is impelling the advanced nations to international justice, are not yet qualified to take a part in such a scheme. Their membership would only be a source of weakness.

Where is the line to be drawn then? How can a clear division be made between the qualified and the unqualified States? The prime necessity for an International Arbitration Court lies in the oppressive military situation of the great nations; and it is chiefly from these nations that the call for arbitration rises. Is it not by these, and these alone, that the Court should be formed? There are the great European nations that particularly feel the stress of military rivalry—France, Germany, Russia, Austria, Italy, and Great Britain. The United States should have membership, for though not burdened by armaments to the extent of the European nations, they possess, by their development and interest in world-politics, every qualification. By their culture, intelligence, and ability, by their apprehension of the forces of Western life, the Japanese are also qualified for entrance into this company of great nations. The inclusion of Japan is particularly desirable, as without her the Asiatic peoples would not be represented, and to them the system would have something of the appearance of an alliance of the nations of the West against the peoples of the East.

The purpose of this limitation must not be misunderstood. It is not to prevent the excluded nations from resorting to arbitration, but solely, in order that the nations chiefly concerned may have confidence in the Arbitration Court, to limit the authority over it and the right of electing arbitrators. The other nations would be free to form an Arbitration Court for themselves, should they desire to do so; and there would be nothing to prevent any of the nations in the scheme from making agreements with any excluded nations to settle all differences that may arise between them by resort to arbitration, either to the Court of the great nations or another.

To the forthcoming Conference at the Hague all the civilised states of the world have been invited, with the exception of Liberia. The assumption underlying its convention, therefore, is that they are all concerned alike in the matters to be dealt with. The success of the effort of the great States to gain relief from the oppression of militarism will depend, however, on their recognition of the distinction between their particular problem and such general considerations of relief from war and the burdens of war as affect the whole world. To deal successfully with their own

problem, the great States should keep it to themselves. To bring it before the representatives of all States is a course of confusion and entanglement, which could have no good issue. The success of the Conference will largely depend on the recognition of this important distinction. Let the representatives of the great nations consider with all the assembled representatives such matters as pertain to them all; but there is nothing to prevent any State from instructing its representative to discuss and ratify with the representatives of certain other States a scheme relating to themselves only.

But would these nations be willing to join us in such a scheme? This question is asked as raising a difficulty. The reasoning underlying it is, that as the other nations have not expressed their willingness, we must assume that they are unwilling, and so the scheme is thwarted at the outset. But no scheme can be realised without initiative. Is it not for us to decide whether we are willing or not, without regard to the attitude of other nations? Ought we not first to decide whether to bind ourselves to submit all affairs of difference that may arise between us and other nations to a reliable Arbitration Court would be a wise course? If our consideration leads to the conclusion that it would, we ought to be willing to give shape to a scheme of this kind. If then we find the other nations indisposed to join, is it not for us to win them to our conviction? If only two nations should be willing, the scheme could be established. These would have the benefit of it, in regard to differences between themselves, and the example would influence others to follow them. It would seem to be prudent to meet the timidity of Governments, in committing themselves to a course of such importance as this, by arranging for the agreements to be binding for a few years only, if so desired. On expiration they could be renewed. In the course of the years confidence would come, and then the agreements would be made without limitation in time.

Harry Hodgson.

SHALL WE TAX LAND-VALUES?

THE APPEAL TO JUSTICE.

> "The tendency of popular discussions to take an ethical form has a cause. It springs from a law of the human mind; it rests upon a vague and instinctive recognition of what is probably the deepest truth we can grasp. That alone is wise which is just; that alone is enduring which is right. In the narrow scale of individual actions and individual life this truth may often be obscured, but in the wider field of national life it everywhere stands out."
>
> —HENRY GEORGE.

MANY opponents of the Taxation of Land-Values boldly venture to appeal to justice, and broadly to condemn this means of raising the necessary public revenues as "based upon injustice," "founded on false economics," and "only commended to the unthinking by delusive promises of plunder." Advocates of this method of taxation willingly, nay gladly, bow to this arbitrament and accept this test. If the condemnation be just, then, indeed, is it to be hoped that the movement "will end in dead ashes." For, in truth, "unless its foundations be laid in justice the social structure cannot stand"; and, so long as it endures, it can only yield fruits like those everywhere manifest to-day, such as would make all ethical-minded men earnestly desire that it should not be allowed to continue.

However, before blindly accepting any such condemnation, let us briefly examine for ourselves what these land-values really are against the special taxation of which the self-constituted defenders of the rights of property protest so furiously, if not convincingly. Let us try to ascertain for ourselves to what causes they can be traced, to whose activities they are due, and to whom they, in justice, can be shown to belong. For manifestly, in justice, only those to whose presence, needs and activities they can be traced, can have any claim to appropriate them, and to be advantaged and enriched by them. We are not here concerned with the question whether the unrestricted private ownership of land—which, since the decay of what is known as the Feudal System, has grown up in England, as elsewhere—is right or wrong, just or unjust, beneficial or injurious to the community at large, expedient or inexpedient. What we are here solely concerned to ascertain is whether these land-values can equitably, and, therefore,

beneficially, be allowed to accrue to the landholders, or whether they can equitably, and, therefore, beneficially, be appropriated for the common benefit of all, and used to defray the necessary public expenditure.

No two separate holdings of land being exactly alike, land-values naturally and inevitably spring into existence wherever a community of men may settle down. Some portions of the land will either be more fertile, or more rich in minerals, or more advantageously situated than the rest. And it is to such natural advantages, either of fertility or situation, that land-values are primarily due. Moreover, as the community increases in number, the demand for land—on which alone it can live, from which alone everything it produces can be derived—increases also; and hence the community has to have recourse to less fertile or to less advantageously situated land. With this process the use, and consequently also the control, of the more fertile or more advantageously situated land tends to increase in value. Thus, land-values are due primarily to the presence of the community, and tend to increase with its increase in numbers, with its advance in the industrial and social arts, with everything, in fact, that tends to make our country a more desirable home, a more productive workshop, or a more prolific and accessible storehouse.

Moreover, with the presence of the community, certain common or public needs arise, and to meet them, the necessity for a common or public fund. With the growth of the community, not only land-values, as already shown, but the public expenditure also tends steadily to increase. Hence it would seem that the natural process would be for the community to appropriate the one to defray the other. But would this be just? Would it be in accordance with the dictates of morality, the demands of justice? This is the question we have yet to answer.

Each member of the community necessarily has to use land, either for housing, agricultural, mining or trading purposes. If each were utilising, or engrossing, a holding of equal value, then it seems as if there could be no doubt but that, in justice, each could be asked to contribute equally to the necessary public expenditure. But where citizens are utilising or engrossing holdings of very different values, as is the case in most communities, would it then be just to demand that each should contribute in proportion to the value of the holding he was being privileged to utilise or to engross? This is the question raised by the Taxation of Land-Values; this is the question that some of its opponents, greatly daring, venture to answer with a decided and emphatic negative.

On the other hand, Adam Smith, the father of the English School of Political Economy, answers this question with an equally decided affirmative. In his first Canon, or Principle of Taxation, this great authority says:

"The expense of government to the individuals of a great nation is like the expense of management to the joint tenants of a great estate, who are all obliged to contribute in proportion to their respective interests in the estate. In the observation or neglect of this maxim consists what is called the equality or inequality of taxation."

"That men *should* be taxed according to their means of payment," to quote oft-used words, is manifestly no principle at all. By no possible sophistry can it be reconciled to the demands of justice. Other things being equal, it would simply mean to put a premium on idleness and prodigality, and to discourage industry and enterprise. To fine men, for any such taxation amounts to a fine, in proportion to their industry and their thrift, in proportion to the use they are making of their abilities and opportunities, would, obviously, be most unjust. On the other hand, equally obvious is it that we can justly demand that each individual citizen shall contribute toward the necessary public revenues in exact proportion to the special advantages he is enjoying. This would cover all special privileges granted to individuals, or to groups of individuals, by the community. In the absence of other special privileges, this would mean that each would be called upon to contribute in proportion to the value of the land, of the natural sources, forces and opportunities, he was being privileged to utilise, to control or to engross. In other words, it would mean that all would contribute in exact proportion to their respective interests in the estate in which, in truth and equity, as in the eyes of the English Constitution, they are all equally joint tenants. Thus, and thus only, and not by any arbitrary system of graduated income taxes and "easily avoided" death duties, can our methods of raising the necessary public revenues be reconciled to the dictates of morality, to the demands of justice. Thus and thus only, can we hope to secure that "equality of taxation," which was the high ideal of the great founder of the English School of Political Economy, as it should be of all who attempt to follow in his footsteps.

To sum up the conclusions we have here arrived at as concisely as possible: We hold that if the individual citizen has a right, in justice, to demand that he shall be secured the fullest possession and enjoyment of anything and everything due to his individual industry, enterprise and thrift—which is the only and all-sufficient justification of the institution of property—then the community as a whole has an equal claim to be secured the possession and enjoyment of what is due to its presence, needs and collective activities, viz., the unimproved value of the land on which it lives and works. That to allow these public values to accrue to individual landholders is necessarily unjust, and consequently injurious to the community as a whole. That to appropriate these public values for public purposes would be just, and consequently bene-

ficial: that it would enable us to defray the necessary public expenditure without infringing on the earnings, or trespassing on the rights, of a single member of the community. And that, consequently, this natural method of raising public revenues, of providing for public expenditure, cannot, save by an abuse of language, be properly described as "confiscation," even though this term may with propriety be applied to any other system that the ingenuity of man can devise to take its place.

To elucidate these points, a little time will not be wasted in comparing the difference between the effects of the taxation of land-values and of other methods of taxation. As every economist knows, every tax on commodities enhances the price of those commodities—*i.e.*, the cost of labour or of money at which they can be acquired—and falls, not on the temporary owner of such commodities, but on the consumers: it creates, as it were, a sort of fictitious "capital," the cost and interest of which has to be borne by the consumers. Thus, if we tax tea, such taxation falls, not upon the grower, or the importer, or the retailer of the tea, but upon those who drink it, the consumers. If we tax coal, such taxation falls, not upon those whose labour draws forth the coal from Mother Earth, nor upon those who own or rather control the use of our coal lands, but upon the consumers of the coal, whether it be for manufacturing or household purposes. In the one case, however, when used for manufacturing purposes, the tax is passed on to others in the increased price of the commodities produced; in the other, when used for household purposes, it has to be borne by the direct consumer, since there is no other to whom he can pass it on. Thus, too, if we tax houses, this simply discourages the building of houses, tends to make houses scarcer and dearer, and falls, not upon the owner of houses, but upon those who live and work in them—*i.e.*, upon the consumers of the houses, if we may use this term. All such taxation falls, then, upon consumers; and falls upon them in proportion to their needs, and in inverse proportion to their ability to pay. For, as everybody who has studied the subject knows, all such taxation falls most heavily and most crushingly on those least able to bear it, viz., on the masses of our wage-earning population, male or female, skilled or unskilled.

As regards death duties, it need only be said that, though defensible, perhaps, as an addition to, these cannot be regarded as a substitute for any definite and calculable source of public revenues. Moreover, *other things being equal*, they, too, place a premium on extravagance, and operate as fines on thrift and prudence. As regards income taxes, it need only be said that it is not the incomes that are earned, but those that are unearned, that there is any justification for taxing in proportion to their amount. And the main source

of such incomes would be reached by the taxation of land-values. Moreover, there is obviously some need for distinction between incomes derived from privilege and those derived from wealth employed in carrying on the industry, the trade and commerce, of the community. Some of our opponents suggest that we should place incomes derived from Consols, from our national and municipal indebtedness, on the same footing as the incomes derived from land-values. This sounds very plausible. But manifestly such taxation would, indeed, be a boomerang that would recoil on ourselves. For all such indebtedness has constantly to be renewed; and when we came to renew our liabilities, or to borrow again, it might be found that for the accommodation we should have to pay, in addition to the ordinary rate of interest, an amount at least sufficient to cover any special tax imposed upon such interest. Hence it is that "Smith, who derives his £100 a year from Consols," need not fear any such taxation. Nor need poor Brown, who "derives £100 a year from freehold ground-rents," worry much about the taxation of land-values, since this ground-rent has no necessary relation to the economic rent of the ground, but is, in reality, a charge, and a first charge, on the whole of the property erected upon it.

The effects of the taxation of land-values can also be briefly summarised. In the first place, it would appropriate for public purposes what is essentially a public fund. To use the words of Henry George, "It would simply take for the community what belongs to the community—the value that attaches to land by the growth of the community; leave sacred to the individual all that belongs to the individual." In the second place, it would place all our landholders on an equal footing. To-day we encourage a man to hold his land idle, and, to relieve him, fine the owner who builds and improves his and the public estate. Thus, let us suppose two holdings of equal unimproved value, the one covered with palatial shops, warehouses, hotels, &c., the other vacant or covered with wretched slums; or the one well equipped for mining, the other held idle and unused; or the one used for grazing, the other for agriculture and market gardens. Imagine anything you please, providing only that the sites are of equal potentiality, of equal unimproved value. Under the taxation of land-values, sites of equal value would be called upon to contribute equally to the necessary public revenues, irrespective of the use to which each was being put. To-day, on the other hand, each landholder is taxed, not according to the value of the privilege he is enjoying, but according to the use to which he is putting it. Let each reader decide for himself which is the more equitable, which is more in accord with the demands of justice.

The manifest effects of such a system of taxation would be to make land cheaper, and more available to land-users. For

under such conditions no one would care to claim to control the use of a single acre of land unless he wanted to use it, and, what is of even more importance, to put it to the best use of which it is capable. To give but one instance, and every reader will be able to multiply it by thousands: Some few years ago one of our most important Northern towns required further dock accommodation. To this end the use of some barren, sandy land, near to the old docks, was necessary. For this the owner demanded some eighty thousand pounds sterling. Of course, he was an honourable man, so presumably if the land had not been worth as much, he would not have asked it. But if it was worth so much, then why should it not have contributed toward the public expenditure in proportion to this value? If this had been the method in vogue, this land, which at the time was bringing in nothing to anybody, and to make which productive required the expenditure of a vast sum of money, would soon have passed at a very different price into the hands of those who would put it to use. To-day, as even our opponents know well enough, the industry of the whole community is being hampered, as well as exploited; the activities of our great municipalities are being checked, nullified, and made more costly; the employment of labour is being made more precarious and uncertain; the reward of labour is being forced down below, and far below, the subsistence level: these and other more evil results follow from the want of that equitable system of raising public revenues known, though the name is by no means an appropriate one, as the *taxation* of land-values.

Under this system the land would be taxed, not in proportion to the value it had a few hundred years ago, but according to the value it has to-day. Next year, or next century, it would be taxed according to the value it will have then; and so on to the end of time: each generation appropriating for its common benefit the value which its presence and activities yearly re-create. But, say our adversaries, "land has been treated as a merchantable commodity in this country for centuries." Well, what of that? It may still continue to be so treated. Other "merchantable commodities," with far less reason and justice, have been and are being subjected to taxation. Why should land be the one "merchantable commodity" to be exempted? As a matter of fact, however, what it is proposed should be taxed is, not land, but land values: *i.e.*, the value accruing to land owing to the presence, needs and activities of the community. And it is the established privilege of being the man allowed to appropriate these values, which is the "individual property" that would be affected, and the selling value of which would be reduced, if not swept away, by this long-delayed measure of Justice.

But, our opponents argue, any such measure, or as some of them

express it, "this sweeping measure of confiscation," would not prevent the holding up of land. They admit that to-day some land is being held up "for a rise," and in "the hope of future profit," to the injury of the present and at the cost of future generations. But they ask us to believe that men would still cling to this hope, and, therefore, act in the same anti-social manner, even though they were annually asked to contribute to public revenues in exact proportion to the value of the land they were thus "holding up," and knew that in every succeeding year they would be called upon to do so: the amount they would have to pay increasing with any appreciation, decreasing only with any depreciation, in the unimproved value of such land. Well, there is no knowing what men might be foolish enough to do. Under such conditions, however, there would clearly be far less inducement to such action than there is at present—when land not in use is practically exempt fram taxation, no matter what may be the price its holder demands for it. Such holders would soon find any such action to be very unprofitable, and to tend to impoverish rather than to enrich those who indulged in it. It may, then, be taken as certain that this natural and equitable method of raising public revenues would, in fact, tend to put an end to all withholding of land from its full and proper uses, as well as to all gambling in our natural and inalienable national inheritance. Moreover, it would tend to reduce the present inflated monopoly value of land, due to this power "to hold up" land, to its true natural or economic, value; thus making the natural outlets to the national industry available to the labour, enterprise, and capital of the people on easier and more equitable terms, and tending to increase not only the productive power of the nation as a whole, but also the earning power of each individual citizen who assists in such labour, or who renders service to those so employed.

Behind every political question there is a moral, an ethical, question. The ethical question behind the taxation of land-values is, obviously, to whom in equity should these values accrue, to some or to all? This is the one question we have attempted to answer in this article. And in conclusion I would fain remind our opponents that "this question cannot be answered so as to satisfy the moral sense of the nation" either by sneering at Henry George, or by inventing fanciful metaphysical analogies between property in land and property in commodities, or between incomes derived from industry and incomes derived from privilege. Such confusing of the issue can deceive only those who wish to be deceived. Moreover, I would remind them that "confiscation," "plunder," and "robbery" are very harsh terms, which, though necessary, perhaps, to special pleading, do not in reality strengthen weak arguments. In truth, such terms can with far

greater justice be applied to the present system of the exploitation of the fruits of the activities of the community by land monopoly, a system which the taxation of land-values would help to change for the better. However, no radical change is possible without some vested iniquity suffering; and, therefore, the special pleaders for those who have expected to benefit by its continuance, may, perhaps, be excused for indulging in a little hysterical shrieking. Still those who would take part in this great controversy would do well to remember dear old Punch's pertinent words:

> "Differences exist, no doubt;
> Let us calmly fight them out.
> But to call each other names,
> Is the vulgarest of games."

L. H. Berens.

THE SCIENTIFIC ASPECT OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

THE trend of evolution of human society must depend upon the changes in constitution, in thought and action of its individual units. Such changes in the individual are partly determined by the reactions of the rest of society as a whole or a part, and partly by the innate forces of the individual. That masses survive and minorities suffer is a truth we need hardly recount. The metabolism of the social organism consists in a continual series of readjustments which are never quite the same. These innumerable readjustments are permanent for longer or shorter periods, and so surely as they arise in an anabolic process, so surely do they disappear in a kinetic one. Each area involved in one adjustment contains within itself an indefinite number of other adjustments in varying stages of stability, which affect the stability of the larger adjustment. The more transitory phases of stability represent the experiments of society, and exhibit the empirical method by which the whole evolves.

The very nature of the component units renders it certain that no condition or system of nice balancing can continue as such for longer than a limited time beyond which the units still exist. This important fact is well shown in the rise and fall of empires, of systems of administration, of systems of religion and of education, each and all of which had seemed to be built for eternity, so far as the superficial or limited observer could say.

The survival of the fittest must obtain, and in human society this survival is regulated in great part by sentiment. The basic instincts of men rule the tide of affairs, and this weapon of instinct is, like unto the sword of Damocles, ever ready to descend whenever the prevailing factors have ceased to prove of value to society as a whole, or to the particular section concerned. We must observe that in no one of the many growths of special social activities, founded on a few grains of fact, and nursed by neurotic champions into a larger but often false creation of a great truth, are we to look for the apical point of social development. The patriots of Free Trade on the one side, and of Protection on the other; of increase in armaments, and of drastic reductions in naval and military personnel; of the power of science, and of its vague and uncertain possibilities when compared to those of the man of business; of religion in

schools, and the abolition of religion; each and all announce their discovery of various great truths.

What we mean by this apical point is represented by the aggregate of those social conditions which are destined to survive for a considerable period, and have great influence on the condition of the whole. Such progressive parts of the social organism are with difficulty located, but as the study of man becomes more profound, and human biology becomes more understood, we shall be able to sift social activities, and point with great approximate exactitude to what must be cultivated and selected for the benefit of succeeding generations, and to what must be performed to successfully grapple with the environment of the immediate future. Thus shall we attain to rational modes of procedure in all departments of life; and the foundation of such knowledge, be it observed, must be laid in biology. In the wider application of this knowledge, as in dealing with education, we seek to determine the trend of present activities, and to turn the tide of affairs in a gradual way.

This is the recognised policy of all stable administration. This is the policy which animates to some extent even the present Liberal Government of this country, and, as an example, we may point to their dealing with the religious factor in national education. Many have considered this action of the Liberals to be typically radical, but we contend that social development is not against it, and that it is a healthy sign of the times.

Let us briefly follow the development of the religious factor in education in this country. To understand this development more clearly, one must first take note of certain other facts in the biology of the social organism. Men tend for the most part to form their reasonings on their emotional activities; their prejudices have to be considered; individual welfare gives way before precedent, and things before words. The material, the means of subsistence, is the groundwork for all theories and systems. People who earn a comfortable living, so long as a certain social condition is maintained, are in strenuous opposition with all factors that go to break it up, in spite of fine theory, of intellectual and abstract considerations. These old stable systems have to reckon with the growth of new forces as readjustments increase and survive in other directions. Either they must go into oblivion, or else their several parts come to perform some of the functions of a new and larger readjustment in a process of absorption.

We could scarcely direct our attention to a better instance of this phenomenon than that provided by the Established Church of this country. The original function of this august corporation was in ruling the people, and particularly in controlling their intellectual and ethical development. Appealing more to the deep-seated instincts of man, and less to his mental endowments, it could rule by

persuasion. So it came about that the rational development of a whole mass was retarded to advance the material welfare of the few —a process of simple cosmical evolution. Here were sown the seeds of national education; and whilst a few educated themselves, and were persecuted in consequence of the light they threw on Church errors, the great bulk who did become educated received their training at the hands of the clerics, for the prevailing idea was that all mentally endowed men should be apprenticed to the Church. Thus, although education was a great feature in the power which the Church exercised, it was but a secondary consideration to the real motive for upholding the Church against all possible assault. The particular system of education that the Church gradually extended amongst the people was so calculated that those who were brought under its influence would generally become adherents of the creed it taught. This increased extension of education by the Church did not have the effect which no doubt it was originally intended to have, and, educated men exploring into literature, came to analyse the writings of religion, and found reasons for making important differences with Church concepts. Thus commenced a process of disintegration which has never ceased to go on. Some of these unbelievers—reasoning, like the Church, from assumptions—were led to new deductions, and to the importance of founding creeds of their own.

The readjustments consequent upon this process of decay resolved themselves into the formation of many separate creeds and religious ideas, and lastly, but not least in point of importance, to the formation of a national system of education. With the growth of these new ideals there was a threatened increase in the rate of disintegration of the Established Church, whose defenders could not be expected to view the rise of Nonconformity with philosophic equanimity. It was, therefore, amid much anathema and dark prophecy that the Board Schools were finally established. The Church did no better thing, perhaps, for maintaining its authority than by vociferating the importance of religious instruction. People's sentiment was touched, and whether they were assiduous in their propagation of the new ideals or of the old, all were agreed that there must be some sort of religious instruction. The Church continued to make its creed a part of instruction practically for all scholars; it was not content with its Sunday Schools, and did not lose an opportunity of exercising its own peculiar powers. Children who up to that time had failed to become acquained with biblical myths and wondrous histories were now initiated into these things. Under the name of Religion all children were carefully prepared in elementary theology, not only on Sundays, but on week-days also. These children, brought up under the ancestral diocesan shadow, came to believe implicity in what was told them, and grew up to take

the place of the preceding generation of church-goers. The Established Church was in this way performing its natural function. Similarly, the many other centres of interpretation of Christianity carried on their functions. These religious bodies having no schools of their own, and seeing no means of supplying the deficiency, were only too glad to give their support to the State Schools, provided that religious instruction would form part of the curriculum.

As in the case of Church Schools, elementary theology under the name of religious teaching, was imparted to the children of the Board Schools. The governing bodies of the various sects reasonably expected that if the children were brought up to understand Scripture, they would more likely become adherents to a particular sect than if they had not obtained such knowledge. Children still went to Sunday School at the bidding of their parents, who thought it a respectable kind of thing, and this going to Sunday School was the preliminary to the formation of the Chapel-going habit, and to the final inhibition of certain sets of ideas.

It will be perceived that the struggle for existence between the religious sects was a hostile force to any movement likely to be instituted by men of scientific thinking, and particularly if these were slow of bending before the fierce wind of ecclesiastical bigots. This antagonism is, of course, primarily due to the natural desire of each sect to maintain an independent existence. It was highly important that children trained in the tenets of a particular sect, did not come under the influence of another, particularly of the Established Church. The latter, on the other hand, was most solicitous for its children to be kept beyond the pale of other sects. These desires were difficult of attainment owing to the distribution of the population. The war of religious instruction went on, and based as it was on material interests quite apart from the ethical principles possessed by each party in common, it exhibited that characteristic bitterness which curiously enough has always marked the strifes between the parties of religion.

Few people had the temerity to suggest that religious instruction was a thing for Sunday Schools if it was required at all, and that the legitimate business of the day school was essentially in imparting a knowledge of facts and bringing these to bear in the exercise of various mental processes.

Religious instruction has been in the past nothing more nor less than elementary theology, and it promises to be nothing more in the future. There are schemes for giving the children moral lessons, but this is no better. Few seem to recognise that the actions of men, and more particularly children, are regulated, not by their reading or being told tales of wrong and right doing; but by the stimulation and lessons they receive in their intercourse with others. A great proportion of children read newspapers, but does

the narrative of a thief's trial prevent the reader from similarly encroaching on his fellows? No, obviously. Witness again the natural tendencies of children exhibited at every turn, and the repeated reiteration of one or both of the parents day after day and month after month for the same offences with no real alteration except when age and experience have combined to change the character.

Civilisation had greatly advanced before the advent of any of the great teachers of religion. During long centuries of experiment, the healthy survivors constituted social development, and as each century passed the process by which advancement was made became an easier one. Theology stepped in merely to unhinge man's nature and to pervert his emotions, to retard his mental development, and to check his general progress. When, however, a great bulk of mankind had severed themselves from the religious yoke, progress went on rapidly and permanently, which means that there was also an ethical development apart from the intellectual. There was a resuscitation, so to speak, in the progressive evolution of social systems, and that at a period when religious zeal was far below what it had been. Prior to the practically dormant period in the advance of civilisation, there had developed that ethical system which, being afterwards seized upon by religious leaders, persisted to a greater or less extent through the dark periods of human history, and has emerged to-day as triumphantly independent of teachers of religion as it was at the beginning.

If, after cool reflection on the many lines by which Society has advanced, those well-meaning people still believe in the panacea of religious instruction, let them have it. We will remind them, however, that the attitude taken up by thinkers on scientific lines, the waning influence exercised by the Established Church and by even Nonconformity, and the spreading belief in practical Christianity, is a manifestation of the trend of modern social development, a tendency towards a state of things in which among the many new readjustments not the least will be the obliteration of religious instruction.

Along with an evolution in a social system must go a change in the functions of its parts. The functions of religious bodies are undergoing modification, and the most important of these is undoubtedly in their waning influence on individual thought, and in their decreasing jurisdiction over the education of the young. When, finally, ideas on religion come to be founded entirely on a practical basis, and moral ideas come to be regarded apart from theological dogma, it will be seen how futile and fallacious are the attempts to prevent wrong-doing and encourage right-doing by instructing children in the theory of it and holding up to them fabulous examples of ancient people wholly devoid of interest. The

interest of the young is centred on the present and the living. Tales may amuse and even excite admiration from the very few finer natures, but in the business of practical life, individual interests determine what sentiments will hold. The altruistic instincts are there with the egoistic, but no amount of dogmatic teaching, and story-telling (in its literal and colloquial sense) will determine which is to predominate in any one social transaction. To think that it would is to suppose that such teaching would cause a permanent alteration in certain brain tissue, whereas the likelihood of any such structural change would be prevented by the more potent influences of the home and out-of-school life. This is obviously what takes place.

Religious instruction is calculated by its supporters to make a moral person. We challenge any authority to adduce proofs that up to the present religious instruction has given us those beneficent natures it is supposed to, or has acted appreciably in effecting a reduction in egoistic impulses. Again, can it be shown that the bulk of the children who have attended Sunday-schools have grown up better citizens, or that these people have produced better as a further generation? Have the world's wastrels been those who lacked this sort of education? We are inclined to think that the result of any statistical inquiries into these questions would show nothing definite in either case, but rather that the religious education was a factor that did not affect the result.

True religious education is obtained in the school of experience, and so is moral instruction; the one spirit is father to the other. Immoral tendencies must be checked, but observation proves that the brake must be applied when the tendency is exhibited or it will fail to act. Further, the brake should be visible and ever present to the mind of the would-be transgressor, and be as far removed from the theoretical as possible. To teach ethics or morality would be a theoretical mode of procedure, and as stated before, the more potent influences out of school would upset whatever impressions may have been produced. The conduct of a true teacher in his dealings with his pupils would tend to inculcate ethical principles, and that is all we deem necessary.

In conclusion, we cannot over-estimate the importance of the necessity for good social conditions, suitable to the needs of the people, calling into activity the social instincts and promoting the best of those variations in nervous tissue upon which depends most probably the various tendencies of good and evil.

A state like Russia, or even Germany, may be worked like a machine and appear in good order, but unless there are favourable conditions of social life for the production of good variations which can lead an orderly independent existence in any part of the great world, such an automatically-worked state will go to pieces directly

the mainspring of administration is released. Without wishing it to be implied that I lend support to so-called socialistic doctrines, it may not be out of place to say that if the time, energy and money spent in this country in the discussion and serious contemplation of religious questions as applied to national life, were utilised in the direction of sound education, of administrative social work, and in the subsidising of scientific investigators, we should hear less of discontent and falling industries, see less proceedings at the courts, and find that the ideal formulated in the brain of the generous theologian was to be approached by a different route, far more direct in its course than that taken by the vague and unstable specific of devised formulæ and specially-contrived mechanisms.

GEORGE TALBOT.

THE PROGRESS OF PHILOSOPHY.

A RETROSPECT AND A PROSPECT.

Kant, in the preface to the first edition of his *Kritick of Pure Reason*, denounced metaphysics as the arena of endless contests. Time was, he said, when she was queen of all the sciences, but the day had come when it was the fashion to despise and look down on her. And so the matron mourned, forlorn and forsaken like Hecuba

> "Modo maxima rerum,
> Tot generis, natisque potens
> Nunc trahor, exul, inops."

Despite this sympathetic and feeling allusion to her fate it was not Kant's avowed intention to restore her to greatness, or even allow her, in the evening of her unhappy life, a modest competence upon which she might retire with dignity. Indeed he would appear to have only reminded her of better days for the purpose of consoling her with the reflection that her claims were totally unfounded, and that she might be thankful for ever having been allowed to enjoy honours which she never really deserved.

But, whatever Kant's intention may have been, his examination of the claims of Queen Metaphysic led eventually to her recognition by a younger generation. Kant's critical investigation was not sufficiently critical,—he was never the out-and-out democrat that Hume was, and so he was in the main deferential, and betrayed a transparent sense of the majesty and sacredness of her person which soon attracted to her those of a warmer and more sympathetic temperament than his own.

Once more dethroned and neglected, she sought a hospitable shelter for her old age in this home of lost causes. Here she still drags out a weary existence, thanks to a few small annuities granted her out of the funds of the more ancient and richly endowed universities. But it has long ceased to be the fashion to pay court to her. Science, politics and commerce are the powers before which we bend the knee. Poetry and art, too, are suffered to hold their private levees, and are patronised by a set which socially, at all events, is the very best. As much may even be said of Spiritualism and Christian Science. But why should we call

attention to the unhappy Hecuba, and rake up her past? She may be a bogus queen, but she no longer imposes upon us.

One might answer this somewhat natural question by pointing to many controversies and disputes in which the old hopeless contests may still be recognised, though the arena in which they are fought does not purport to be that of metaphysics. Such an answer is the standard one in an age of enlightened criticism. But may we not find another in our present needs? Is not some sort of philosophy required to correct a certain one-sidedness of thought which seems to be the danger of the specialising tendencies of the age?

Among the many problems that are at present engaging the attention of thoughtful minds that of Education is one of the most important. The subject is one which, from its relation to life, must always be of extreme interest, but the difficulty of determining on what lines education should proceed, and to what matters it should in each case be directed, seems now to have reached a more acute stage than it has ever done heretofore. This is obviously due to the growing complexity of the social machinery and the more intricate and elaborate work for which it is designed. In every direction labour is becoming more and more specialised, and the individual must be specially trained for the special part he has to play. If prolonged study of the classics does not yield results—valued almost entirely with reference to fitness for some special employment—commensurate with the labour expended upon them, then, it is said, this is not an age in which we can afford such luxuries of education. Illuminated by such considerations of practical expediency, our college curriculums are undergoing gradual modifications. In the more *go-ahead* universities Greek has ceased to be obligatory. Latin is still retained because certain sciences use it for the construction of their vocabularies, and, also, because the commercial upstart desires that his son should be able to translate the *Dulce Periculum* or *Semper Memor* which he has taken as the motto for his ancestral coat-of-arms. The modern languages are esteemed because they are considered, and rightly enough, to be of use when intercourse with foreigners is necessary, and so increasing stress is laid on the importance of a conversational knowledge of the languages studied. And outside the college walls, too, we find evidence of this same conviction that modern education must be directed to adapting its pupils for the special work by means of which they may hope to earn a living. One hears on every side the demand for technical education. Technical education is the infallible means of ensuring the welfare and progress of a nation.

However, the more far-seeing members of the community seem to recognise that something more than a special training for some special work is necessary to ensure fitness even for such special

work. "The complex machinery of society" is an expressive term, but it may be misleading. The unity of its purpose is not sufficiently deep to completely absorb and hold the complete individuality of the units of which it is composed. A man cannot be made into a mere abstraction and regarded as nothing but a screw or a piston in some piece of machinery which performs some particular work. This is so obviously true that it suffices to pass at once to the final observation that, apart from all other considerations, if a man is only to work eight hours in the day and sleep another eight, there still remains a third of his day that must be dealt with. For during that time a man is as much a member of society as at any other, and as closely connected with it. It is then that he appears as one of a family, and it is then that he forms those ideas which as an elector of a representative government he must form, and it is then—for his work as a wheel in the social machinery is often one of extreme drudgery, that he is most of all an object to himself, and, at the very least, his occupation during the eight hours he has *to himself* must re-act upon the all-important hours of work.

And so our universities have a difficult problem to face. Is a knowledge of science sufficient in itself to make a man complete and perfect after the plan and divine image of his Creator? Here and there a more courageous professor of Mental and Moral Science ventures to suggest that the study of philosophy would be a suitable antidote to the exclusive tendencies of modern Education. Can it be that Kant's *O moi talan* is to be allowed once more to raise her head and minister to our needs? Might we not once again advantageously make an offer of regal employment to the unhappy queen?

Unfortunately the mere fact that there is a throne vacant and a situation as Queen of the Sciences to be filled is not sufficient ground for restoring unhappy Hecuba to her ancient splendour. We must be satisfied that she is qualified for the post. But her past is against her. It excuses us for questioning her competence for discharging the duties of the regal office, and for suggesting that perhaps she may have only herself to blame for the sorry plight in which she so continually finds herself.

Looking broadly at the matter one may observe that Metaphysics has always been getting herself into trouble for the same follies. She has only one idea of replenishing her exchequer, and that is by an unlimited issue of paper money. Any thought of a specie reserve never enters her head. What was the cause of the discredit into which she had fallen during the decline of Scholasticism? Was it not the perception that all she was doing was distinguishing and dividing, and spinning a complicated web over the whole surface of experience without in any way elucidating its meaning? She was making a great fuss and busying herself immensely, but

without accomplishing anything. What was the meaning of her method, and what relation had it to actual facts? By what means were her imposing edifices constructed? Where did all the bricks and mortar come from? These are the kind of questions that have always confounded metaphysics. Have not your hundred thaler notes a mere face value? Do they not expressly refer to gold which you do not possess, and which you have no means of procuring? When did you ever pay a penny on them? We hear much talk now in the metaphysician's camp about analysing an experience which is no experience in particular, and we are told much concerning what such experience implies. But whence come the principles of that analysis? What relation have they to the experience analysed? Is anything extorted from experience in the abstract beyond the mere exhibition of the method of analysis? In fine, when it is said that experience implies so much, what is the value of that implication? Is a modern implication of much more value than a mediæval distinction? These are the kind of considerations which seem to have thrown discredit upon the business methods of metaphysics.

But are the terms metaphysics and philosophy synonymous? Perhaps the decline of metaphysics merely marks a stage in the onward course of philosophy. If so, there may be some hope that in the present century a wider diffusion of philosophy may counteract the tendencies of an excessive specialisation. That the general public, despite the little encouragement given to it by the professors of so-called philosophy, feels the want of a comprehensive *weltanschauung*, and so justifies hopes for the progress of true philosophy, is evidenced by the wonderful popularity and wide-spread sale among all classes of such works as Haeckel's *Riddle of the Universe.*

Can we then present a view of the course of philosophy which does not make the discredited system of Hegel appear as the last word? Such a view of the course of philosophy has already been offered by Auguste Comte, and has met with considerable favour. It must therefore be the starting-point of our criticism.

Comte's account is expressed in his famous law of the *Three States.* "This law consists in the fact that each of our principal conceptions, each branch of our knowledge, passes in succession through three different theoretical states: the theological or fictitious state, the metaphysical or abstract state, and the scientific or positive state."

It may be remarked that the positive state seems rather an ideal. Is there at present a single science which is truly and wholly positive? Perhaps it may even be rash to suppose that the human mind will ever attain to knowledge which is completely positive. Certainly all the knowledge we possess is limited by the necessary

conditions of the possibility of the representation of objects. We frame for ourselves conceptions by the aid of which we represent what we call *the fact.* To a thinker who has no particular bias it might well seem that such conceptions as God, freedom, and immortality, so far from being the mere remnants of a theological state, stand to ethics in a precisely similar relation to that in which such a conception as progress stands to sociology, evolution to biology and cosmology, substance, matter, and force to physics, and space and time to mathematics, not to speak of logic to the whole sphere and domain of representation. All these conceptions may be attacked. Kant's question, *quid juris,* may be asked in respect of them all. They must submit to criticism. And this criticism in its results seems to show that such conceptions are rather the means and artifices by which our intelligence grapples with the facts, than a colourless exposition of the positive content of the facts themselves. Comte says that with the positive philosophy theories are recognised as a mere means of co-ordinating the facts. To this it may be answered that a philosophy which establishes that this is the sole function of a theory is to a certain extent critical, and so far commendable, but so long as the theories are the bone and muscle of the facts the positive state remains an ideal. At present it may be said that all along the line the conceptions that lie at the basis of the co-ordinating theories are incorporate with the facts themselves, and it is only because they are made so that the co-ordination is in any sense a co-ordination *of the facts,* and not merely a quite extrinsic and irrelevant division of them. And just so far as the so-called positive philosophy has failed to recognise this so far is it not yet even a critical philosophy.

Positive philosophy, says Comte, declares its absolute ignorance of the ultimate nature of any body whatsoever. Presumably this declaration, despite its wording, is not intended to imply that the body has an ultimate nature of which we are nevertheless ignorant. Herbert Spencer seems always to suppose an ultimate nature, a thing *per se,* of which we are ignorant, but not so Comte. This being so, a more accurate statement would be that positive philosophy knows nothing of an ultimate nature of bodies. But positive philosophy can only be conscious of, or know, itself as positive in so far as it knows that its facts are facts, and that its object *is* in truth the ultimate nature of bodies, or, in other words, that we are not justified in supposing that bodies have any ultimate nature beyond what positive philosophy concerns itself with, or, in yet other words, that the ultimate nature of any phenomenon is the complete explication of the phenomenon itself—that phenomena are phenomena of nothing but themselves.

It follows from what has been said in the last two paragraphs that positive philosophy can only arrive at a full understanding of

its own meaning and import by first passing through the state of critical philosophy.

But between critical philosophy and positive philosophy there is an intermediate position. This is occupied by speculative philosophy. True speculative philosophy is philosophy in full possession of the results of criticism. It is preparatory to positive philosophy. The latter is its ideal. Speculative philosophy not alone recognises the subjective character of the means and artifices by which intelligence attempts to make objective truth its own, but it is able to assign its appropriate logical function to every symbol which is used to figure forth and represent the given fact. It is philosophy conditioned by an art and mechanism of representation of which it is a complete master. How far we may have advanced with or towards such a philosophy, he alone can say who has some appreciation of the significance of critical investigation.

These considerations enable us to distinguish five successive states of the philosophic mind, viz., the so-called theological or fictitious, the metaphysical, the critical, the speculative and the positive.

It is not to be supposed, however, that each of these states must be over and done with before the next begins. This appears true in many ways. The business of the mind is differently developed in different departments of its activity. This difference is strongly insisted upon, and perhaps somewhat exaggerated by, Comte. Sociology has, perhaps, not reached the same stage as the exact sciences. But the critical philosopher knows that social science as a theory, and apart from social development, is somewhat of an abstraction, and so he is quite ready to listen to the suggestion that, perhaps, life, with the greater breadth and comprehensiveness that belong to it, and its greater measure of concrete reality, has grasped aspects of the truth overlooked by a philosophy that has rashly proclaimed itself to be positive before it has arrived at being truly critical. Still Comte's observation is in the main true even in this regard.

But with respect to difference of development within the particular spheres themselves there is perhaps more unevenness than has been recognised by Comte. The body of each of the particular sciences seems to approach nearer the positive state at what we may call its center of gravity than at its extremes. The general body of physical science tends, probably, very much towards the positive state. But in its fundamental conceptions it still shows traces of the metaphysical state, while in those changing and oft-remodelled conceptions and theories by means of which it seeks to grasp its latest acquisitions it is probably rather speculative. Again religion is in its ritual, at least apparently, mainly in the

fictitious state—though many who support and conform to it may do so from the speculative or the critical point of view, while in the formula in which its doctrine is expressed it is apparently, and with similar reservations, mainly metaphysical. In its ethical teaching, however, it seems more advanced.

In the course of philosophy, as well as within the particular systems themselves, difference of development is also to be found. It is not necessary for the philosophy of one stage to have reached its culminating point, or attained its final expression, before the younger philosophies of the next stage make their appearance. A man may be born before the death of his father. So philosophies mainly critical in their tendency have come upon the scene before metaphysics had said its last word. But such younger philosophies have been conditioned by the imperfect development of the philosophy of the preceding stage. In launching forth their criticism upon the prevailing systems of metaphysics they were really limited by the very philosophies they were attacking. If Kant had had the *Logic* of Hegel before him when he wrote his *Kritik of Pure Reason* he would not have allowed himself to have been so bound down by the fundamental presuppositions of the Wolf-Leibnitz school. It is this limitation of the Kantian critical philosophy that explains the subsequent development of the great metaphysical systems of Fichte, Schelling and Hegel.

The inclusion of the critical state among the five above enumerated may seem open to objection on the ground that all philosophy is essentially critical, and that beyond criticism it is nothing distinctive. Criticism is the sole creative act of the philosophic mind as such. The positive state embodies a philosopy over and above the particular sciences only in so far as it has created for itself the standpoint from which it may regard and know itself as positive. Similarly the metaphysical state is nothing beyond a general standpoint, or point of view, which emerges as a criticism of the particular fact.

But there is a definite stage of criticism in which a standpoint is evolved from which the logic of the methods pursued in the attempt to attain to truth is questioned and estimated. It expressly defines itself as a standpoint from which certain presuppositions may be looked down upon as misleading. At first it shows itself as a mere subjective misgiving. But by its very affirmation of subjectivity as *mere* subjectivity, it from the first affirms its own standpoint as objective, or as above the antithesis of subjective and objective. Hence the culminating point of the critical state is reached by the critical philosophy which sees its truth in positive philosophy.

The various stages in the growth of the philosophic mind being as above described, there remains the problem of determing the point in the course of development to which philosophy has already

attained. Naturally, such a question cannot be answered dogmatically. Statements can only be made which are obviously dependant upon the standpoint of a line of criticism which has to be adopted without sufficient justification. But, then, the problem set down at the start was to find a point of view from which we could regard ourselves at the present day as having still before us a promising road for the advance of future philosophy. So, all that can be attempted is to lay down assertorically a view of the course that philosophy has taken, and the direction in which it is now moving.

With the earliest mythology the theological, or fictitious, state of philosophy had certainly begun. It is also safe to say that with the Eleatics a stage of the metaphysical state was reached. A more difficult question would be to determine the exact position of the philosophy of the Ionics and Pythagoreans. Did they belong to the first stage of the metaphysical or the last of the theological? Now, the essential characteristic of the theological state is that it contains at once the germ of metaphysics and of science: neither is, as yet, properly distinguished; and this is just the peculiar feature of the philosophy of the Ionics and Pythagoreans. This view is corroborated by the fact that the last stage of each of the states approaches nearer so the positive state than the earlier stages of the succeeding state. They seem to be merely shut out from the idea of the positive state by the colouring of their appropriate mental attitude. Thus the distinctly scientific tendency of the Ionics and Pythagoreans just fell short of the idea of the positive state by reason of their sympathy with the cruder ideas of the theological state. Similarly there seems little to find fault with in the philosophy of Hegel beyond a certain tone of voice. Just as we feel that Pythagoras interpreted his numbers somewhat mystically, so we feel that Hegel interpreted the categories and the course of the Logic somewhat mystically. Hegelianism sounds like a positive philosophy falsified by an explanation and uttered in cathedral tones. It just misses that easy conversational style that one attributes to the positive state.

The metaphysical state, which may, then, be taken to begin with the Eleatics, exhibits three distinct stages. For the metaphysical state may be defined, from a critical point of view, as that state which ultimately rests on the presupposition, tacit though it may be, that "the existence of Logic proves in itself that we can think about thought," and that the ideas which we derive from the application of the logical method of analysis to the logical forms themselves are such a thought about thought, or, in other words, that the reduplication of Logic gives us a true insight into the essence or inner nature of thought. And so there are three stages corresponding to the logical distinction of Term, Proposition, and Syllogism,

and they arise from the dialectic which is evolved by the application of the logical analysis to the ideas of what are taken to be the activities of thought supposed to be expressed in those terms, viz., Conception, Judgment, and Reasoning. Hence the first stage is busied with the union of the *One* and the *Many*, the second with the opposition of the *Knowing Subject* and the *External World*, the third with the *Absolute Idea* and the given *World-Process*.

Each of these stages comprehends within itself a regular course of development. There is a movement from thesis to antithesis and then to synthesis. But this is not because this movement is native to thought itself but it rather exists as the only way of correcting the original error of a false dialectic arising out of our artificial way of representing things.

The Eleatics began the cycle of the first stage with the assertion of the *One* or *Being* as that which alone *is*. But the development of their philosophy in the hands of Xenophanes, Parmenides, and Zeno was only the progress of the demonstration that according to their standpoint everything that we know anything about, or which we could with any meaning say *is*, belongs to the side of the *is not*. All predication was of the *is not*. This contradiction led to the predicate receiving its share of attention. Heraclitus led the way with a *Becoming* in which the *is* and *is not* were held in solution. With Empedocles, Anaxagoras, and the Atomists these two elements, or correlates, continued to be recognised and were attempted to be rendered more definite, with the result that they stood more and more apart, and ended in irreconcilable opposition. So the Sophists followed and insisted on the concrete concept. They dragged the abstract *One* of the Eleatics into the stir and bustle of life, they placed the subject in the phenomenal world, they contended for its objectivity. But they failed to make the necessary modifications which this advance required. They left the world into which they brought the *One* or Subject, as concrete concept, in the same untractable state of flux as before, and they left the subject as abstract and devoid of a principle of unification as the *One* of the Eleatics. Hence the Subject became a mere punctual existence, the momentary *it is* of the individual consciousness. Still they did great things, and the Golden Age of Greek Philosophy shaped itself as an attack on the Sophists. Socrates by a system of definitions, which implied permanent relations, gave to the concept that unity and identity with itself that preserved it amid the fleeting world of change. Plato developed this aspect of the *Subject* still further, and found himself in a position to completely overthrow the teaching of the Sophists. This he did, entirely missing, at the same time, the moment of truth which their philosophy contained. With Plato the concept removed itself further and further from the phenomenal world, and became, in everything but name, as abstract as the *One*

of the Eleatics. His world of *Ideas* on the one side, and his *Matter* on the other, were in as hopeless antagonism as ever. His feeble attempt to unite them by the idea of *Participation*—an idea which could not belong to the world of Ideas—reminds one of many similar efforts by which other systems of dualism have made themselves ridiculous. It remained, then, for Aristotle to close the cycle of the first stage of the metaphysical state. *Matter* and *Form*, for so he named the two elements which had been contending for supremacy, are nothing but the moments into which the judgment breaks up for itself the living truth. It is the distinction in which the fundamental *energeia* expresses itself.

Against such a system as that of Aristotle critical philosophy has little or nothing to say. Aristotelianism, in its essential character, merely falls short of true speculative philosophy in that it only sees its truth from its own metaphysical way of looking at things. It does not quite understand itself *as a simple return to sanity*. Such a philosophic outlook as that of Aristotle is merely reinstated by criticism with the additional character of obviousness. It is regarded in the same way as Hegelianism—*i.e.*, as a perfectly adequate system *to use* in the representation of truth. But what the metaphysician as metaphysician values in these systems, criticism looks upon rather as the framework, and says that the worth lies in the account of experience which is put into the framework and not the framework itself. Criticism of Aristotle may express itself by saying that he was the greatest philosopher of all time, and that he had also, of course, an adequate system of metaphysics, one that there was nothing wrong about, one which did not stand in his own way, and one which showed that he was not the victim of a dialectic which threw a false light over what he was considering. But owing to his position in the course of philosophy, his account of the world of experience has the appearance of a proof of the truth of his system of metaphysics, it takes the form of such a proof, whereas the metaphysics is really only the convenient vehicle for the expression of what is supposed to prove its truth.

The critical stage could not be completed until dialetic had run its course. And so, although Aristotle covered the whole ground, and, if we accept the systematic exposition of the relations between the categories eventually furnished by Hegel, said all that was to be said, metaphysics had still to tread the same weary round twice again, though on a different level of dialectical error. As before a superficial account must suffice.

With Descartes the dialetic which arises from the ideas of the functions of the logical judgment begins to assert itself. Here we meet the specifically dualistic metaphysics. With the Greeks all dualism was within the sphere of objectivity. But with Descartes the knowing Subject, the Subject which judges about things, is for

the first time put into opposition with a world-to-be-known. Granted the *ego*, what is given to it, and how can it be given, and how is the *ego* related to the *non-ego*? The whole cycle of views that before presented themselves are again repeated here on this new plane. The central point was reached in the metaphysical half of Kant's philosophy. Then comes the same formula of reconciliation as before—the underlying *X* is the truth, and in it the one element distinguishes itself as against the other. "In the *ego* I oppose to the divisible *ego* a divisible *non-ego*"—said Fichte. And he was quite right; but there was nothing in what he said—only the absence of that amount of falsehood requisite to give glowing colours to a system. It was merely an adequate formula, and it is difficult to make much out of such material.

The cycle of the last stage of the metaphysical state ran a rapid course, thanks to the careful way in which the whole field had previously been covered, and the close study which from this time onward was devoted to the work of preceding philosophers. The growing respect for the History of Philosophy is the promise and potency of the critical state. In his last stage the antithesis of *ego* and *non-ego* gives way to the unity of *Reason*. The limited standpoint of the judgment is transcended. The universe is a syllogism, a complete and closed circle. The difficulty that then arose was that of reconciling the process in time and the contingency of the world with the idea that only the rational *is*. How can a process in time be of any concern or moment to Eternal Truth? The difficulty is clearly seen in one of Schelling's attempts to solve it:

> "In an absolute sense nature is nothing but infinite activity, infinite productivity. Were this to realise itself unchecked, there were produced at once with infinite velocity an absolute product, whereby empirical nature were unexpressed. But if the latter is to be expressed, if there are to be finite products, then it will be necessary to assume that the productive activity of nature is checked by an opposed retarding activity, also existent in nature. A series of finite products is the consequent result."

From a metaphysical point of view the fault with Schelling's first accounts of the Absolute is their abstractness. In the later accounts, on the other hand, the Absolute is taken in too material a sense, it becomes a mystified nature. It loses its character of rational. It ceases also to be a logical process.

Hegel completes the last cycles and closes the course of the metaphysical state. Logic is made absolutely consistent with itself, on the assumption that it is not a mere art of representation. It is deprived of the power to mislead us with a false dialectic. Intelligence is no longer allowed "to stand in its own light." All the errors of preceding systems may be regarded as attempts to define the Absolute by means of a limited category. And, as to

the opposition between Reason and the World-Process, the Truth is the Rational Process. Eternal Truth is not made to subject itself to time relations as something alien to itself, but the Truth is a process that generates time within itself. The fundamental point in Hegel's teaching is that what appears to be given to thought to mediate is nothing but the immanence of thought itself.

Of the preceding stages it will be remembered that the first closed with a return to the unity of the concept, the One in the Many, the second with a return to the unity of the judgment, it is in consciousness that I distinguish *ego* and *non-ego*, so the third returns to the unity of Reason as perfect syllogism. The Logical Idea, Nature and Mind are merely the moments of the movement in which thought is mediated and returns to itself. In short, it may be said that all metaphysics has advanced as a search for unity and reconciliation, and that its last word is that all that it has been sought to reconcile is absorbed in the Absolute Truth as a timeless logical relation.

So much for the metaphysical state. The critical state has, like the metaphysical three stages, for it refers itself as criticism to the metaphysical state; but the different stages do not, as with metaphysics, run through a cycle of phases, because it is precisely from the error that causes this cycle that the critical stage in each case frees itself.

The first stage of the critical state is represented pre-eminently by David Hume. He was the first philosopher to create a real critical standpoint. This standpoint was the given *impression*, the meaning of which term is not to be falsified by supposing a reference to external causes. This *impression* was the true term of the logical judgment. It was given. And what did not justify itself in the given *impression* was merely subjective. The synthesis of the judgment was the result of a process of psychological association.

The great luminary of the second stage was Kant. His standpoint was the unity of the experience which is *mine*. He reinstated Hume's *impression* as the given *matter of sensation*, and justified the judgment as a function of unity by which *the given* is made an object *for me*. But the syllogism he regarded as a source of illusion. It gives rise to ideas of reason which have, indeed, a logical function, but do not present us with an object of possible cognition. It is here that the *impurity* of Kant's critical standpoint shows itself—one can hardly, as is often done, speak of Kant's inconsistency in this connection, as the so-called inconsistency goes down to the very roots of his system, and could not have been avoided without a change in his fundamental position. The cause lay in the original impurity of his standpoint. He held to the intimate relation between Logic and Thought. Hence the syllogism

was the procedure of Reason itself, and the ideas which it originated were consequently native to the mind. It was necessary, therefore, that they should serve some rational purpose, and so he allowed them a logical function as setting before us an ideal of completeness, and assigned to them in this way a meaning in reference to experience. But having this reference and being regarded as original to the mind, his position was open to the interpretation that in truth no fault is to be found with the ideas of Reason—it is only experience that is to blame in that it must always fall short of the Idea. So the result at which he arrived seemed to filter down to the mere assertion that our cognition is limited, and that no such cognition can be adequate to the infinite. This, of course, left it open to his successors to say that thought must transcend the finite in order to proclaim all cognition to be limited. The infinite was the true ground. Hence metaphysics was given a new lease of life. It was able to set to work securely on the plane of Reason. It had nothing to fear from the criticism of Kant, provided it took up Logic in its entirety, as an organic unity. Kant had given objective validity to the Understanding at the expense of Reason, and against him Hegel was able to show that it was in Reason alone that Understanding had its moment of truth. The Doctrine of Essence can only maintain itself as merged in the Doctrine of the Notion.

It is easy to see that Hegel had made good the above position the critical state could not advance beyond the point to which Kant had brought it. Metaphysics had not said its last word. Logic had not shown its full strength.

But now, thanks to Hegel, we are in a different position. And the result is that outside the Universities, Hegelianism is discredited. It is not so much that it has been refuted as that it has been shown deficient in solid worth. A standpoint, requiring, perhaps to be more accurately defined, is generally adopted, and from it the system of Hegel seems to have as little in it as the Rational Psychology which Kant attacked. The soul is a simple substance, said the Rational Psychogists. But, assigning to these terms their appropriate logical values, this merely means, said Kant, that

"In all judgments I am invariably the determining Subject of that relation which constitutes the judgment. And so it is in an apodeictic and identical judgment to say that the I of the *I think* must always have *in thought* the value of a Subject and of something which cannot be taken as belonging to Thought after the fashion of a mere predicate. But it is quite another thing to say that, regarded as an object, I am an independent and self-subsisting Essence or Substance."

Similarly it would seem that Hegelianism may be disposed of by showing the simple point of view from which all that he says

is in a sense quite obviously true. The only difficulty is that of estimating how near Hegel himself approached to this standpoint.

Reference has already been made to the fact that all metaphysics is, to a certain extent, criticism. Hegelianism may, in fact, be interpreted as consisting wholly in criticism. It is a criticism of the relations of the categories *inter se*, or criticism of the entire system of Logic made from the logical standpoint. But it moves wholly within the limits of the logical presupposition. It takes logic at its own estimate as an absolute science of thought as it is in itself, and merely makes it consistent with itself on that assumption. But it is not criticism that belongs to the critical state proper because there is no whisper of a suggestion that the complete system might be called in question from the standpoint of something beyond or behind it, that the entire and consistent whole might be dependant upon a certain presupposition. There is no advance to the sceptical position that after logic had been made adequate to the representation of the truth, it might still be in its own proper nature quite subjective, a mere art of representation, the form of which is conditioned and determined by an altogether contingent and empirical relation.

Hegel showed that all the parts of Logic cohere as an entire system, and that all must stand or fall together. The partial failure of Hume and Kant lay in their not having recognised this, on metaphysics in their day not having made good this position. Hume accepted the *datum* as a term of the judgment. But if the *datum* was good *as a term of the judgment*, if it was something of which we could say what it is, then the judgment was good also. Kant accepted the unity of the judgment as constitutive of an object of experience. Hegel then showed that he was bound to admit the higher synthesis of the syllogism. The course of metaphysics has accordingly prescribed to criticism its next problem. The question must be raised as to whether the entire system of Logic is not a mere art of representation, the origin and development of which must be studied, and which shows itself to have evolved as an analytical method, the principle of which exists wholly for the quite special purpose of the communication and recording of thought. That some such interpretation of Logic is possible appears from the following passage in Kant's *Kritik*: "Hence the only conceptions that are left to us as capable of definition, are those which contain an arbitrary synthesis which can be constructed *a priori*. Definitions are, therefore, to be found in mathematics alone." Kant's meaning is that we can only define what we ourselves make to suit our own purposes. But all the fundamental conceptions of logic are susceptible of definition. So, too, are the conceptions of things which arise as ideas of logical

functions. Kant has himself defined the idea of the absolute subject.

The problem above stated has never been fairly met. But there it is. And until it is solved the speculative state, not to speak of the positive, cannot be completely realised. This justifies our conviction that philosophy has still a lengthy road to travel.

The mere statement of a critical problem, however, is not very suggestive, and it is unlikely that it will seem convincing. Some brief indication must, therefore, be given of the way in which it is conceived that it may be worked out.

The *proposition* is the true logical unit. Now, every proposition is in its express statement a synthesis of terms. These terms are related as subject and predicate, and the question is, What is the real import of that antithesis? It is, of course, not suggested that the problem, in this form, has never been considered—most works on logic do, as a matter of fact, discuss it, and, according to the criticism of metaphysics above given, every metaphysical system depends tacitly, at least, upon some theory as to what the true meaning is; but what is suggested is that the view that the distinction exists solely for the purpose of the representation of thought, has not received proper attention. The more elementary works on logic do certainly, for the most part, define the subject as that about which an assertion is made, and the predicate as that which is asserted about it; but no one seems inclined to take these definitions very seriously, or to offer the account which they give of the proposition as a deep and significant truth. They are thrust aside because no one in his senses would take the distinction to be a fundamental one lying at the basis of thought itself, and it is presupposed that the distinction has its root in a fundamental antithesis of thought itself. But the very ground on which they are rejected as trivial is precisely what recommends them to the critical mind which has reviewed the course of metaphysics.

Hegel is the one philosopher who seems to perceive how fatal such an account of the logical judgment would be to metaphysics. He combats the account most strenuously, and rejects it contemptuously as an insult to, and a travesty of, thought—presupposing all the while that the true distinction must have its basis in thought. Now, on his assumptions, his reasoning seems irrefragable. There is a distinction between the subject and predicate. The subject is not the predicate. But every affirmative judgment asserts that the subject is the predicate. Now, what is to be said to this? For my own part, I see no alternative between either accepting Hegel's account, and with it the essentials of his whole system, or else denying that the antithesis belongs to thought. For if both the antithesis and the synthesis belong to thought, what escape is there from Hegel's position? If, however, the antithesis belongs solely

to our mode of representing thought, which is dynamical, by means of terms which are statical, while the identity belongs to thought which in itself is indifferent to the distinction, then the contradiction disappears, and with it the whole of Logic as a science of the laws and forms of thought.

These laws and forms, to which such importance has been attached, become wholly relative to the method of logical representation. The logical judgment has a principle of its own according to which it breaks up the given concrete unity of thought for the purpose of representing it as the synthesis of elements of which it can make a wide general use in the communication and recording of thought. The laws of Identity and Contradiction merely define the method of reconstructing the unity, and can have no meaning except in relation to the principle of analysis. The law of Excluded Middle is simply a postulate. Logic only applies to a field of which language is in complete possession. The law of Excluded Middle merely postulates the adequacy of the logical method to perform its work of representation in a field so prepared. Hegel's criticism seems to make it quite clear that the law has to do with nothing but the representation of thought. The law of Sufficient Reason resolves itself into this "Every judgment is potentially a syllogism," and merely defines the mode of extension of the logical analysis. It may be pushed further to the statement "Every syllogism is potentially an infinite sorites"—which is about as capable of proving the existence of God, freedom or immortality as the statement that a line is infinitely divisible. But this is just what metaphysicians would have it do. Kant shows clearly how the idea of an Absolute Subject depends on such a sorites. The Absolute Subject is a pure logical fiction. For true philosophy it is just what Euclid's point is for physical science—useful in the service of a method of representation.

To return to the two alternatives given above, it may be remarked that a justification of the belief that the second is the one that should be adopted is impossible here. It must suffice to have indicated its significance. The whole complex system of logic requires to be criticised. Critical tests must be settled for deciding whether certain elements are really moments of thought itself or not. Supposing the result of the application of such tests is to lead to a negative answer, then the entire system of logical forms must be deduced as the condition of the possibility of the representation of thought.

It is conceived, however, that if the deduction of logical forms is carefully and impartially worked out it will show that while the development of logical distinctions results merely in distinctions, which, as such, are purely logical, the necessity for the further development in each case lies in a development of thought itself.

The logical unit, the judgment, presupposes the thought which is to be represented, and though the distinction belongs to the logical method, it has, and must have, an application to thought, and so the development of the method must have a certain relation to thought. Hence the criticism of logic must give a clue to the process of thought. It is this fact that explains the plausibility of Hegelianism. It cannot be said that logic has nothing to do with thought. There is a power behind the scenes. But for that Aristotle and Hegel could not have been so successful with their general philosophy.

Supposing the above work accomplished, it would be necessary to proceed to a complete deduction of the categories. The categories are functions (in the mathematical sense) of logical ideas. They arise with the continued application of logical methods to the representation of thought, and are left by the race as signposts along the road. They have a reference to thought, but they are no more thought itself than the signposts are the road.

The deduction of the categories being completed, the nature and origin of dialetic would require to be exhaustively treated. The deduction of the categories should make it clear that their only valid application is as functions in the representation of thought, and that, *per se*, they can never stand for an object of thought comprehended in its truth, or as it is in thought. The great distinction is not between *noumena* and *phenomena*, but between thought and the representation of thought, and it is only *in* the latter that the categories apply *to* the former. A category, taken *per se* as an object of thought, is a mere surd. The logical method may be used and the categories availed of in the representation of thought, but logic cannot be applied to its own products, the categories, as if these were objects *per se*, for the purpose of an *a priori* system of metaphysics. Dialectic is the result of such a reduplication of logic, and its sophistries must be exposed if speculative philosophy is to make any steady advance.

When the task of examining the nature of dialectic is completed it will then be possible by means of a clear statement of the logical function of each category to substitute for the dialectical problems which are the source of endless and unfruitful controversy, corresponding problems which, though they may never be capable of being fully and completely answered, since they are stated with a reference to a logical ideal of absolute completeness in the synthesis of representations, are still such that all science and all life and all philosophy may be regarded as a progress *towards* their solution. The perfecting of such a work as the above would form a fitting propaedeutic to speculative philosophy.

Such, then, would appear to be our exact position in the History of Philosophy. We require a comprehensive system of Neo-

Kantianism, one which, while true to the critical spirit of Kant, would recognise that every fundamental distinction taken by Kant is in its immediate statement dependant upon the stage which metaphysics had reached in his day, and one which would avail itself of the advances made by Hegel—but for the purpose of opposing itself to Hegelianism as a system of higher and more conscious criticism.

JAMES CREED MEREDITH.

THE PROGRESS OF INSANITY IN OUR OWN TIME.

The wide field of physical science may be searched in vain to discover a form of human suffering that appeals so powerfully to the compassionate feelings of mankind as insanity. No other evil that flesh is heir to, no bodily disease whatever, not even pulmonary consumption which, during recent years, has awakened the attention and won the sympathies of so many generous philanthropists and earnest thinkers and workers in the cause of humanity, or that other most loathsome of all physical diseases, leprosy, can be compared with the terrible scourge that deprives man of the great characteristic—reason—which distinguishes him from all other created beings, and the want or deprivation of which reduces him below the level of the brute. No wonder that the distressing subject of mental breakage has for such a great number of years engaged so much of the attention of scientists, statesmen and philanthropists in all civilised countries. No wonder that so many Royal Commissions and Select Committees have been called upon to inquire into the condition of the mentally unsound, and especially why it is that their numbers are annually increasing so rapidly. No wonder that, in the endeavour to cope with this great evil, lunatic asylums have been multiplied at the cost of so many millions [1] to the taxpayer—palatial residences provided with all the resources of civilisation for the treatment and "cure" of this mysterious affliction which, so far, judging from results, seems to baffle the efforts of the most learned and resourceful scientists. No wonder that such lavish expenditure is annually devoted to the maintenance of the insane poor [2] and no wonder that scores of Acts of Parliament have been passed in the hope of arresting the spread of the malady. The real wonder is that, what must be called, the almost superhuman efforts made to combat the insidious disease appear to have had no effect whatever in staying its progress but, on the contrary, have resulted in a regular annual augmenta-

[1] The cost of pauper lunatic asylums up to the year 1903 is £24,442,367. (Return No. 290 of 1904.)

[2] The total cost of maintenance for the year ended March 31, 1903, was £3,479,590; arrived at by combining columns (*a*), (*b*), and (*c*) of Return 290 of 1904.

tion of numbers for over half a century. There surely must be some existing cause, misunderstood or unrecognised, that produces such an extraordinary effect in the face of the counteracting influences referred to. What can it be? The momentous question has been repeatedly asked. Is it possible that the great asylums for the insane poor, established with such beneficent intentions, and at such prodigious cost to the country, have not had the desired effect, but have operated contrariwise in propagating the taint of insanity from generation to generation? This is a question that has to be very carefully gone into. To seek to evade the candid consideration of it or to attempt to obscure, by sophistical arguments, the actual facts, would deserve the severest censure. The peculiarity of the question lies in this that, although the great increase in the numbers of the insane is universally admitted, *the increase of the disease* of insanity is officially controverted. As will be shown in the following pages the apparent, or official, increase theory is absolutely inconsistent with the facts and figures furnished by the heads of the lunacy departments themselves, and printed in their Reports annually presented to Parliament. The lunacy departments, English, Irish and Scottish, are all in perfect accord on two points, viz., the enormous increase of the numbers of the insane and the unreality of the increase of the disease. According to recent articles in the Press, and notably in the *Times*, "the numbers of the insane in confinement have increased fivefold in sixty years," that is to say, in a little over two generations; or since the, so called, curative system came into vogue. From that date down to the present time the provision of asylum accommodation has been continuously increasing, as claimants for admission present themselves, and, in quite a number of cases, temporary annexes have been hastily run up in connection with existing asylums to meet the ever-increasing demands for more room. Of course the actual, and enormous, increase of numbers does not admit of any quibble or tergiversation; it is there and cannot be evaded or denied. It is best to give the opinions of the lunacy authorities in their own words as printed in their official Reports. To take the Commissioners in Lunacy first. Having, in their special Report to the Lord Chancellor, dated February 22, 1897, dealt with the actual increase of numbers, they go on to say (1):

"We have thus, by means of the figures within our reach, *demonstrated* at least the *probability* that much of the apparent increase of insanity has been due not to an increase in the incidence of the disease, but of the aggregate of the persons affected by it and to their redistribution; in other words, that insanity has not greatly increased out of proportion to the increase of population, but that the numbers of the insane have

greatly so increased, and that they have been so *redistributed* as to give the *impression* of an actual increase of the disease."

(2) In their forty-ninth Report to the Lord Chancellor the commissioners in lunacy say:

"In our last Report to your Lordship we offered some considerations to *combat* the idea that insanity was largely on the increase in England and Wales; and we reiterated our opinion that the undoubted large increase in the number of known lunatics was mainly due to causes other than an increase in the disease of insanity in its more active forms, and we endeavoured to indicate some of those causes."

These citations will no doubt be looked upon by some people as ingenious specimens of special pleading in support of the Commissioners' fallacious theory of "apparent increase," but others may regard them as calculated to mislead the Lord Chancellor of England who, by virtue of his high office, is the guardian and protector of all lunatics in Great Britain. The Commissioners, however, in their Special Report, p. 26, inform the Lord Chancellor "there has been and will be in every year a varying but permanent addition to the general list equal to the number by which the discharges and deaths together fall short of the total number of admissions." The *Times*, in its issue of April 14, 1906, said: "We publish this morning articles from correspondents upon two aspects of a question of manifest national importance, namely, the progressive increase of insanity and the inadequacy of the existing provisions for the care and treatment of the insane." Having in its leader of April 14 last, referred to the reform introduced by Lord Shaftesbury in 1845, by which the present Commission was instituted, the *Times*, in mentioning the fact that "In sixty years the number of the insane in confinement has increased fivefold," puts the gravity of the situation in a very startling light. The great space it has devoted, in its issues of April 14 and 21, 1906, to the discussion, shows the importance attached to the subject. Much might be said on both the legal and medical aspects upon which the *Times* lays so much stress, but which, after all are comparatively trivial when looked at from the point of view of the enormous increase of the numbers of the insane.

To pass on to the Irish branch of the question. The *Freeman's Journal*, one of the leading organs of public opinion in Ireland, says, under date March 17, 1906:

"The increase of insanity in Ireland gives grounds for the gravest apprehensions. When all explanations and excuses have been considered and discounted, the appalling fact remains that, with a decreased and decreasing population, we have a large increase, not relative but absolute, in the number of the insane, Worst of all, the increase is progressive, absorbing each year a larger proportion of the population."

Per contra the official opinion is expressed in the Special Report of the Inspectors of lunatics in Ireland, published in 1894, as follows:

"The facts and statistics we have as yet obtained *and the Reports of the different Resident Medical Superintendents throughout Ireland* do not justify us in stating, with any degree of scientific accuracy that conclusive proof exists that any general increase of insanity has taken place in the country . . . The conclusion at which—as at present advised—we have been able to arrive may be briefly summarised as follows . . . that the great increase of the insane under care is mainly due to accumulation, and is so far an apparent and not a real increase."[1]

This statement is absolutely inconsistent with the Reports furnished to the Inspectors by the resident Medical Superintendents of the Irish district Lunatic Asylums. The true facts are set forth in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW of February 1905, pp. 207 to 209, and are in perfect accord with the opinions previously expressed by the inspectors themselves in several of their annual Reports to the Lord Lieutenant, of which the following is a specimen:

"In our Report of last year[2] we stated that we were *driven* by the facts before us to conclude that the large increase of lunacy has been absolute as well as relative. Those who contend that, though the total number of insane under care has gradually increased, this increase is apparent only and not real, attribute it to various causes. . . . Although these causes would account for a very large relative increase of insanity, still we must adhere to our opinion that they are not sufficient to explain the great increase of lunacy that has taken place of late years in this country."

Now as to Scotland. The General Board of Commissioners, having put on record in their Annual Report the fact that "the number of lunatics under the jurisdiction of the Board has increased 190 per cent.", say in their Special Report to the Secretary of State for Scotland "the statistics which at present exist do not make it possible to state positively either that insanity is increasing or that it is not increasing." On this point it is well to mention that in January 1858 the number of lunatics officially known to the Board was 5,794, and that in 1904 they totalled 17,241. As indicative of the views of the General Board of Lunacy for Scotland the Commissioners stated in their Annual Report (for 1904) "The ever-growing demand for additional accommodation for the insane, the large scale on which it has been found necessary in many cases to provide it, and the magnitude of the expenditure involved, have recently been the subject of much discussion."[3] Again in their report for 1905, recently issued, they say, "since 1858 the number of lunatics under the jurisdiction of the Board has increased by 200 per cent., while the increase of the population during the same

[1] Special Report, p. 14. [2] 42nd Report, p. 3. [3] 47th Report, p. 21.

period has been 56 per cent." They further observe, "It is shown by the last Census Returns that there is a large number of persons of unsound mind in Scotland who are not officially known to the Board, and there are beyond doubt numerous others of unsound mind who do not appear as such in the Census Returns."[1] These statements seem to be inconsistent with the doctrine of "apparent increase." Yet the departmental dogma is held in Scotland as in England and Ireland, the members of the triple alliance being all steadfast in their loyalty to the apparent increase theory. Some of these quotations have been cited before, but it is necessary to repeat them. When a contumacious nail cannot be driven home by a few strokes of the hammer, it has to be struck again and again with added strength until it is compelled into its proper position. As said in a previous article, "iteration is too powerful a means to an end to be disregarded, especially when the question lies between truth and error." What is that question? Simply this—Is insanity increasing or not? On the one hand, as just quoted from the *Times*, the increase has been fivefold in sixty years; on the other hand the tripartite official dictum is that though there has been undoubtedly a great increase in the numbers of the insane there has not been any increase in the disease of insanity itself. There is here a distinct conflict between independent and official authority. To assert from the facts and the figures before us that there has not been any increase of insanity appears to be one of the most untenable propositions ever advanced even by a perverse or paradoxical intellect. The ways of permanent officialism are truly marvellous, so marvellous as to be positively beyond the comprehension of ordinary mortals. These words are not meant to apply to that phase of official lunacy or, to be more accurate, ministerial madness manifested on a recent memorable occasion when the nation, with some notable exceptions, lost its head and seemed to be seized by a sudden paroxysm of insanity, fortunately of a temporary character, best expressed in the single word Jingoism, going stark, staring, raving mad, and, in a fit of maniacal excitement brought on, like other forms of lunacy, by evil habits and influences, rushing headlong into the abyss of an unjust and iniquitous war, a war that brought ruin and devastation into the peaceful and happy homes of so many thousands of innocent people and placed a burthen of £250,000,000 of taxation on the shoulders of the English nation. The classes who profited by the outlay of such vast sums of money in the piratical raid being chiefly manufacturers of lethal weapons, ammunition and military stores, together with a host of army contractors, stock jobbers, company promoters, predatory adventurers, *et hoc genus omne.* Two "distinguished Generals" must be added to the list—Field-Marshal Lord Roberts, who dis-

[1] 48th Report, p. xiii.

tinguished himself as Commander-in-Chief in India by issuing Rules and Regulations for the management of Chaklas Anglice brothels[1] and the providing of a regular supply of sufficiently attractive young women for the soldiers under his command, and Lord Kitchener, who is credited with the wanton massacre of non-combatants, old men, women and children at Omdurman when the fighting had ceased. No, the reference is exclusively directed to what appears to be the maladministration of the lunacy affairs of the country as exemplified by the procedure of the permanent officials who are invested with administrative authority and under whose jurisdiction there has been an all-round increase of great magnitude in everything relating to the insane. This increase must, to all appearances, continue, and in fact be interminable unless by some providential interposition, its progress is arrested. To understand the question thoroughly a brief retrospect is necessary, otherwise it might be thought little or no interest was taken in the subject until quite recently.

The first Act of Parliament dealing with pauper lunatics[2] was passed so far back as 1744. Subsequently (1816) a Committee was appointed to inquire into the whole subject, and various reforms in the care and custody of the insane were effected; but, the number of lunatics continuing to increase, other Committees and Royal Commissions of inquiry were nominated, the terms of reference including, *inter alia*, the cause of such increase. The Select Committee of 1859 went exhaustively into the whole subject, no phase of which was left unexplored. Lord Shaftesbury, then Chairman of the Commissioners in Lunacy, was the principal witness examined. His examination lasted over a week, during which he was asked 922 questions. His replies cover a hundred folio pages of the Report of the Committee. Several other distinguished authorities on the subject of insanity also gave evidence on the occasion. The first volume of the Report extends to about 400 folio pages and contains the answers to 3424 questions. The *Times* and the *Freeman's Journal* are strictly correct as to the continuous growth of insanity—if anything they are rather under the mark. Sixty years ago the insane in confinement in Great Britain and Ireland totalled in even figures about 25,000. They now total, according to the last available returns, something over 160,000. What does this indicate? It indicates, taking the fivefold increase as a basis of calculation, that in sixty years hence the lunatics in the United Kingdom will have more than doubled their numbers with proportionate increases in the number of pauper lunatic asylums and in the cost of the maintenance of the lunatic poor. Lord Shaftesbury's evidence has been quoted before, but for the purpose of comparing what then was with what now is a short reference to it may here

[1] Parliamentary Paper, No. 197 of 1888. [2] 17 Geo. II. cap. 5.

be permitted. His lordship was asked:[1] "Is it your opinion that there has not been an increase of lunacy in the country?" to which he replied in these remarkable words:

"I am almost afraid of giving an opinion as it may be the commencement of the most awful controversy, as there is a great difference of opinion on that point, because all the data preceding the year 1845 are so very indistinct . . . that it is difficult to say what has been the increase; but since the hon. member (Mr. Coningham) has asked the question, I may as well give an answer here as at some future part of my examination. . . . The increase of lunacy is certainly unquestionable, but it is not by any means in the ratio of the increase of the population."

Lord Shaftesbury went on to express his belief that "one-half, and perhaps more, of the cases of insanity that prevail among the poorer class arises from their habits of intoxication"; at the same time he thought that "education has done a good deal to keep down the drinking habits of the people, and to keep down many of those habits the ultimate issue of which is almost invariably insanity." His lordship refers to the inquiries he had made from Superintendents of Asylums in England and elsewhere, and states

"the result was that they all concurred in this, that if the people could be brought even to moderate habits . . . the result would be that at least one-half of the cases of lunacy that afflict mankind would be altogether got rid of, and a considerable proportion of our lunatic asylums might be shut up or converted to much more happy purposes."

There is no ambiguity here, but the imperfect data then available evidently misled his lordship as to the increase of the insane being less in proportion than the increase of the population at large. It is plain from his words, however, that he thought it possible a time might come when insanity would decrease to such an extent that many of the asylums might be shut up or converted to other purposes. Be it remembered this remarkable statement of a former Chairman of the Commissioners of Lunacy was made nearly sixty years ago, when the number of the registered insane all told only totalled about 25,000. Several articles on high non-official authority have, as already stated, recently appeared in the public Press. They leave not a shadow of doubt as to the reality and magnitude of the increase. Meanwhile, *pari passu*, the awful controversy predicted by Lord Shaftesbury has been proceeding with growing intensity for over fifty years, the departmental dogma all the time being that there is no actual increase of the disease—nothing more than an accumulation of the numbers of the insane from various causes. Another important inquiry, by a Select Committee of the House of Commons, took place in the year 1877, resulting in the issue of a ponderous Blue Book of about 600 folio pages, when an increase in

[1] Question 51.

the number of Lunacy Commissioners was suggested; but the suggestion, unfortunately, was not acted upon. There is every probability that an alternative, in the form of the infusion of some new blood into the Commission might have had a most salutary effect, and probably have led to a successful effort being made to put a stop to the perennial increase of lunacy in the United Kingdom; that is, provided the right men were found who would have the courage of their convictions and who would not, in face of the fact that the numbers of the insane have increased fivefold in sixty years, "combat the idea" that insanity is increasing, or who would, owing to the insufficiency of asylum accommodation, sanction the erection of emergency buildings in which matchwood boarding and felt, saturated with a resinous compound, were used, a piece of folly that recently led to the holocaust at Colney Hatch, when fifty-one patients were consumed amid scenes of indescribable horror.[1]

The foregoing references to the past are introduced to show how deep an interest was taken in the subject, and how grave were the apprehensions entertained, as to the future generations, before anything approaching the magnitude of the present development of the disease was thought possible. The last serious effort made to deal with this painful subject constitutes an entirely new departure in connection with the insane, and is not unlikely to result in a further large addition to the registered numbers by the inclusion of all idiots, epileptics, imbeciles, and feeble-minded and defective persons, not certified under the lunacy laws, in the category of the mentally unsound.

The following are the terms of reference to the Commission, appointed in September, 1904, that has been holding its sittings in the Royal Commission House, Old Palace Yard, Westminster, under the chairmanship of the Earl of Radnor.

"Care and Control of the Feeble-minded.

"To consider the existing methods of dealing with idiots and epileptics, and with imbecile, feeble-minded, and defective persons not certified under the Lunacy Laws; and in view of the hardships or danger resulting to such persons and the community from insufficient provision for their care, training, and control, to report as to the amendments in the law or other measures which should be adopted in the matter, due regard being had to the expense involved in any such proposals and to the best means of securing economy therein."

The Report is not yet issued, but is eagerly looked for by all who take an interest in what, to adopt the language of the *Times*, is "a question of manifest national importance." So far only the increase in the numbers of the registered insane has been dealt with; we now come to "consider the cost" of the increase. A return of the total expenditure on *land and buildings* up to the year 1893 was

[1] *Vide* report of inquest in the *Times* of January 31, 1903.

presented to Parliament in August, 1895, which put the outlay at £18,291,790. By a return to an address of the House of Commons, granted on the motion of Mr. Charles Hobhouse, and ordered to be printed July 29, 1904, it appears that the expenditure on land and buildings up to January 1, 1904, that is to say, in ten years, has increased by £6,150,577, and now totals £24,442,367. In an article dealing with the subject of increase, printed in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW of February, 1905, it was stated:

"It will be impossible to ascertain, until the next return is issued, what the cost for the ten years ending 1903 amounts to; but from a careful study of the information within reach the expenditure under this head will probably bring the figures up to £24,000,000 in even pounds. While the annual outlay under the head of maintenance will be found to amount to about £4,000,000."[1]

In both cases the forecast was a close one, from which it will be seen that the statement printed in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW could be relied upon as substantially accurate.

It was intended in this article to bring the statistics of insanity in the United Kingdom up to date, so as to show the actual increase of numbers for the year ended December 31, 1905, but it is impossible to do so for the reason that the English and Irish reports have not been issued as I write. On this point the following questions, with the replies given, appeared on the records of the House of Commons during the recent Session. In both cases the reports appear to have been held over until Parliament had risen, as, on applying in the proper quarter at the end of the Session, the writer was informed "the English and Irish reports for 1905 are not yet issued."

The Scotch report, consisting of 268 pages, was issued in due time, viz., July 11, and, speaking from considerable experience, there is no reason whatever why the English and Irish reports could not be laid npon the table before the end of the Session.

"* Mr. William Redmond. To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department when the Report of the Commissioners in Lunacy will be issued; whether his attention has been directed to the fact that an order was made some years ago that in consequence of the issue of these Reports being delayed until after Parliament had risen, they should in future be laid upon the Table earlier in the year; and whether such order had been disregarded?

"I am informed that the Report for 1905 will be presented to the Lord Chancellor on or before the 30th June, in accordance with the provisions of Section 162 of the Lunacy Act, 1890. There is no record of any order to the Commissioners on this subject. A question was asked in 1885, and on that occasion the Commissioners said that they would do all in their power to hasten the preparation of the Report.

[1] According to the Parliamentary Return (No. 290 of 1904), the total cost of the maintenance of patients for the year ended March 31, 1903, was £3,479,590.

"INSPECTORS OF LUNATICS' REPORTS.

"Mr. Clancy (Dublin County, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland when the Report of the Inspectors of Lunatics will be laid upon the Table; and whether he is aware that latterly such Reports have not been issued until after the rising of Parliament, so that there is no opportunity of referring to them when the Estimates are under discussion?

"Mr. Bryce: The Inspectors of Lunatic Asylums inform me that they hope to present their Report in the course of the coming month. The delay which has occurred in preparing the Report in recent years has been due to the difficulty of obtaining the necessary financial returns from the various asylums. The inspectors have now made arrangements under which the financial returns to be included in their annual Reports will relate to an earlier period than heretofore, and they anticipate that they will be able to present their Reports without delay in future."

It is to be regretted that the official information necessary to complete this article is not forthcoming; however, the subject is of such supreme importance that it cannot be left to rest here. When the report of the Commission on "The Care and Control of the Feeble-minded" is issued, a further opportunity of dealing with the subject of mental breakage, as a whole, from a statistical point of view will arise.

In conclusion, one other startling item in illustration of the increase of lunacy has to be mentioned, a dreadful instance, too, of the progress of insanity in our own time. The more so as it is a particular never alluded to by the lunacy officials in any of their Reports, namely, the terrible tragedies recorded in the daily papers, in which some poor demented creature has committed suicide, having, in many cases, first killed some sane person, or perhaps several, before taking his or her own life. In such cases it generally happens that the lunatic has not been certified as insane, and, never having been confined in an asylum, is not included in the category of the registered insane. This class of lunatic, if the figures could be got at, would be found to add a considerable quota to the annual increase of the numbers of the insane. A few years ago a Parliamentary Return of the numbers was obtained, but on a subsequent application to the Secretary of State for the Home Department the return was refused.

The Report of the Commissioners in Lunacy for the year ended December 31, 1905, has now (September 10, 1906) come to hand. It shows that "the number of persons in England and Wales certified as insane and under care on January 1, 1906, was 121,779, being 2150 in excess of the number recorded on the same day in 1905. . . . The annual average increase for the ten years ending December 31, 1905, was 2504," showing an increase for the last decade of 25,540.

W. J. CORBET.

ECONOMIC ASPECT OF A SINGLE TAX ON LAND VALUES.

The vast sum of money which it is necessary to raise for the purposes of local government, the almost intolerable burden this throws upon industry, especially in certain districts, has caused a search to be made for a fresh source of taxation, and the suggestion to tax land values has been seized upon by members of both the great political parties in the State who have professed to accept the principles involved as both just and expedient—I say "professed" advisedly, because I am convinced that there are many (and I am not referring to one party in particular) who have merely trimmed their sails to suit the direction in which they think the wind is blowing, without ever troubling to assure themselves the principles which they so glibly profess are principles of justice and equity, or not.

Now I wish very much to avoid any such state of affairs, and I therefore propose to give, as concisely as I am able, the reasons which induce me to believe the principle of a single tax imposed upon the value of land is economically sound, for I am perfectly convinced that when you have an assured conviction that the principle is economically sound, its practical application can present no insuperable difficulties.

As there are three agencies or factors in the production of wealth, viz., Land, Capital, and Labour, so it follows that the wealth produced must be divided between the representatives of these agencies. The Landlord takes the Rent of Land, which in its economic sense includes, besides land in its natural state (without buildings, &c.), all natural forces and other free gifts of nature. The Capitalist takes the second share, viz., Interest; while the third goes to Labour in the form of Wages.

Perhaps at this point it is necessary for me to remind you that in ordinary language we use the word "rent" to denote the interest received from capital invested in buildings or houses, which obviously brings it under the second of the divisions just enumerated—that of Interest. It is necessary to remember this so as not to confuse it with the more restricted use put upon it by economists, who, it is perhaps as well to repeat, apply it only to the share received for

the value of the actual land, apart from the value of any buildings or improvements which may be upon it.

The fundamental cause which enables landowners to obtain rent is the difference in fertility and utility which exists between the various portions of the earth's surface.

For example, a farmer is seeking a farm, and two are offered to him. If he considers he can obtain (by the application of the same amount of labour and capital) £800 worth of crops from one and £850 worth from the other, he will be ready to pay exactly £50 more in rent for the second, if the farms are in other respects equally suitable. If the difference in the rents asked is £49, he will take the better farm; if the difference is £51, he will take the worse.

The difference in expected produce will exactly determine the amount of extra rent he is willing to pay. Let us suppose that he is asked £100 for the one and £150 for the other. Now, suppose further that a third landlord comes on the scene and offers a farm rent-free. Our farmer at once estimates the value of the crops he will be able to raise with the same expenditure of capital and labour. If he works out this at less than £700, he will decline the offer, for in each of the other two cases he will have £700 after deducting the rent. Let it be supposed, however, that he estimates the produce at exactly £700.

The three offers are exactly equal, and if the farmer had nothing to consider except the amount of balance after paying rent, there would be nothing to make any of the three offers more attractive than the others. Now, the tendency of competition is to bring about this sort of equilibrium in every department of business. The competition of landowners depresses, and the competition of farmers raises rents; the competition of employers raises, and the competition of labourers depresses, wages; the competition of capitalists depresses, and the competition of borrowers raises, interest; and these forces are daily at work always tending to secure equal prices for equal commodities, equal wages for similar labour, and equal interest for each £100 invested with equal security. Remembering this, we are in a position to determine the rent a farmer will pay for any farm in the kingdom, provided we know at what he estimates the produce he expects to get from any given investment of labour and capital, provided always that he is influenced by no other consideration than the rent and the expected produce. In our example the maximum rent he is willing to pay is got by subtracting £700 from the expected produce. But while the competition of the landowners will prevent the rent rising above this, the competition of the farmers will prevent its falling below a minimum, which will tend to constantly approach this maximum. If we call "normal rent" that rent towards which this competition tends to push actual rent, we say that the normal rents of the three farms, in our

example, are £100, £150, and nothing. To such a farm as our third farm a technical phrase is applied to indicate the sort of land which it will just pay to cultivate if no rent be charged. Such land is said to be on the "margin of cultivation." The conclusion may be summarised as follows: "The normal rent of any land is got by deducting the produce of land on the margin of cultivation from the produce of the land in question," which is one way of putting Ricardo's far-famed "law of rent."

Now, the "margin of cultivation" is a variable quantity. If, for instance, there is a failure of the crops in some other place, or for any reason, a greater demand for farm produce, it will pay to cultivate land which formerly it did *not* pay to cultivate. In this case the "margin of cultivation" is said to descend, and when this happens it is obvious that normal rents will increase. It may be stated, therefore, as a general truth, that whatever tends to bring fresh and inferior lands under cultivation also tends to raise the rents of all lands already under cultivation. Thus, whenever a community advances in wealth and population, rent, too, advances.

But let us go back for a moment, and consider what we have learnt. Since the landowner takes all the produce obtained over and above what could be obtained from land on the margin of cultivation, it follows that the capitalist and the labourer can divide between them as interest and wages only the produce of land on the margin of cultivation, that is, the poorest land in use. Hence, no matter what be the increase in productive power, if the increase of rent keeps pace with it, neither interest nor wages can increase. The moment this relation is realised we have a flood of light upon what before was chaos and perplexity. The increase of rent which goes on in all progressive countries is immediately seen to be the reason why interest and wages fail to increase with the increase of productive power.

The wealth produced by any country must be divided into two parts by what we can term the rent-line, which is fixed by the margin of cultivation. From the proportion of produce below this line interest and wages must be paid—all above goes to the owners of land. Thus, where the value of land is low there may be only a very small production of wealth, and yet a high rate of interest and wages. This we see exemplified in new countries. While, on the other hand, there may be an enormous production of wealth where the value of land is high, and yet a low rate of interest and wages. This we see in any country which has risen to any great extent whatever in the scale of progress. Further, where the productive power is increasing, as it *is* in all progressive countries, wages and interest cannot be affected by that increase, except so far as rent is affected by it. If the value of land increases proportionately to the increase in productive power,

all the increased production is swallowed up by rent, and it is only when land fails to increase proportionately that interest and wages have a chance to increase. Thus we see clearly that far from Capital and Labour being antagonistic, as is usually supposed by superficial thinkers, they have in reality a bond of union (apart from the fact that Capital is but a product oi Labour) in that they are both at the mercy of a common enemy, land monopoly.

But here I should like to emphasise once more the importance of what we have already found, viz., that the law of rent and the law of wages (for we can leave interest out of the question) depend upon the margin of cultivation; but, whereas rent increases as the margin descends, wages decrease, or in other words, *the increase of land values is always at the expense of the value of labour*, and hence the increase of productive power does *not* increase wages, because it *does* increase the value of land.

"Rent swallows up the whole gain and pauperism accompanies progress." It is this law (the working of which I hope I have made clear) which alone gives the explanation of the fact, observable everywhere, that as the value of land increases so does the contrast between wealth and want become more and more sharply defined. Further, it is this law which leads us, when we wish to see human beings in the most abject, the most hopeless, and the most helpless condition, "not to the unfenced prairies and the log-cabins of new clearings in the back-woods, where man, single-handed, is just commencing the struggle with nature and land is as yet worth nothing, but to the great cities where the ownership of a small plot is worth a fortune."

Now as to the effect of the material progress of a country upon Rent. The material progress of the community shows itself under two main aspects: (1) increased population; (2) improvements in the arts and sciences—that is, in inventions of all kinds.

I have already touched upon one of the effects of increased population, viz., that, creating as it does an increased demand for agricultural produce and the other necessities of life, it allows less productive land to be worked at a profit, that is, the margin of cultivation is lowered, and this means that rent rises. But increased population causes rent to rise, from the fact that the increased powers of co-operation and exchange thus brought about give an increased capacity to land.

As an example we could trace the growth of any settlement from the arrival of the first immigrant. Time, however, does not permit. Let us, therefore, take the city as we find it; let us take the case of our own city—Liverpool.

Land here in Castle Street has no greater agricultural productiveness than, say, land out at Maghull, but it has a productiveness of a higher kind. To us as bankers, to shipowners, merchants,

brokers, shopkeepers, manufacturers, with all their vast array of clerks, assistants, and workmen, land here at the centre of exchange will yield more; and this excess the landowner can claim, just as he can claim any excess of wheat-producing power.

Thus, we find that lands which yield the highest rents are not those of surpassing natural fertility, but lands to which increased population has given surpassing utility.

But now, as to the effects inventions have had upon the distribution of wealth. In a word, the effect of labour-saving improvements has been to increase the production of wealth. To produce wealth, we remember, labour and land are essential, so it is obvious that the effect of labour-saving improvements is to create an increased demand for land, which, necessarily, lowers the margin of cultivation.

Thus, though the primary effect of all such inventions is to increase the power of labour, the ultimate effect is to increase rent, without wages or interest receiving any advantage. Here, then, is the explanation of the otherwise inexplicable fact that labour-saving machinery everywhere fails to benefit the working classes.

These are the fundamental laws and principles which, to my mind, amply demonstrate the reason why the enormous increase of productive power which is the outstanding feature of the past century has failed to benefit the vast majority of the people.

Under our present social system of land monopoly, land absolutely necessary for the existence of all is held by a few.

On every hand we see these landholders, through the ever-rising value of land, taking year by year from labour and capital an ever-increasing share of the national production of wealth, not on account of any exertion on their part, but because of the higher productiveness given to it by the people themselves.

To equalise the distribution of wealth, to give justice between man and man—for surely each has an equal right to live: yet how can one live if the right to the land be denied him?—in a word, to amend our present system, a tax on land values comes easily and naturally, as a simple matter of justice.

And this remedy of a single tax, had it no other result than the twofold obvious effect of bringing into productive use all valuable lands and of relieving capital and labour, of all other taxes, whether direct or indirect, should commend itself to the favourable judgment of all serious-minded men.

But, banishing as it would, not only poverty, but the fear of poverty, it must have such further and far-reaching results upon the higher and better development of the race, that from our present limited outlook appear too idealistic to be possible.

Andrew Scott.

JAMES GRAHAME, POET AND PREACHER.

It is somewhat strange the neglect that has befallen certain Scottish poets, who were once famous, and whose works are spoken of in memoirs and correspondence of the time in eulogistic terms. To select but three of them, all of whom were contemporaries. The robust humour of Tennant's *Anster Fair* appealed to Lord Jeffrey and to the Ettrick Shepherd and his friends, whilst Sir Walter Scott declared that Mayne's *Siller Gun*, a graphic account of the annual wapinshaw instituted by James VI. at Dumfries, surpassed the efforts of Fergusson and fell not far short of those of Burns. Yet these two writers must be mere names to most people, since their poems have not been republished in recent years. And on the religious side, the novelist, most generous of critics, was not less sincere in his admiration. He hailed with delight the advent of James Grahame, author of *The Sabbath*, and, when he received the news of his premature death, he wrote a touching letter to Joanna Baillie to express his regret:

> "Poor Grahame, gentle, and amiable, and enthusiastic, deserves all you can say of him; his was really a hallowed harp, as he was himself an Israelite without guile. How often have I teazed him, but never out of his good-humour, by praising Dundee and laughing at the Covenanters! —but I beg your pardon; you are a Westland Whig too, and will perhaps make less allowance for a descendant of the persecutors. I think his works should be collected and published for the benefit of his family. Surely the wife and orphans of such a man have a claim on the generosity of the public."[1]

No life has ever been written of Grahame, and indeed there is little to be said about him personally for his days were uneventful, but this noble tribute from the greatest of his countrymen is worth volumes of biography.

History is silent as to his ancestry and early years. Born April 22, 1765, he was a native of Glasgow, his father being a prosperous lawyer and a staunch Whig, who in the summer months retired with his family to his villa by the Cart in Renfrewshire. The river flows between low and wooded banks, and the scenery in

[1] Lockhart's *Life of Scott*, vol. iii. 354. 1848.

its upper reaches is specially picturesque. Here dwelt Burns gallant weaver where the tranquil stream

> "rins rowin' to the sea
> By monie a flow'r and spreading tree,"

and its beauties have also been sung by three other poets who came from the same district, Campbell, Tannahill and Grahame himself. Such surroundings cannot but have had an effect upon him, and, his mind being naturally impressionable, he turned his thoughts in the direction of poetry. His career at school and the university was distinguished; but against his own inclination, which was to study for the Church, he was compelled to enter the office of his cousin, Laurence Hill, in Edinburgh, and in 1791 he became a writer to the Signet.[1] He disliked the work intensely, and on his father's death four years later, hoping that he would have more leisure for developing his poetical tastes, he was called to the Scottish Bar. But only moderate success attended him there. His legal knowledge is said to have been extensive, and, according to a writer in the *Edinburgh Annual Register* for 1812, his failure was mainly due to his continuous ill-health, which prevented him from undertaking much laborious exertion. While he was an advocate, he wrote a pamphlet on the introduction of trials by jury for civil causes in Scotland, which earned the praise of his contemporaries. This project was a favourite one with his party, and the Whig ministry brought forward a measure dealing with the subject. The bill was not, however, carried owing to the sudden change of government, and it was not until after Grahame's death that this mode of trial was established

His earliest effort, apart from some verses which he printed in his university days for private circulation, was *The Rural Calendar* (1797). It is an unambitious attempt to delineate the progress of the year in the manner of Thomson's *Seasons*, and it was soon followed by a tragedy on Wallace, of which, perhaps luckily for his reputation, only a few copies now remain. In 1801 appeared a dramatic poem, entitled *Mary Stewart*, which is disappointing. The first scene is a dialogue between Elizabeth and Sir James Melville, based on their famous interview at Windsor regarding Mary, when the Scottish Ambassador adroitly avoids the direct question, "Which is more fair the Queen of Scots or I?" by replying, "She within Scotland's realm, in England, you."[2] And unfortunately, like this interlude, the rest of the play is merely a

[1] *The Scottish Nation*, by W. Anderson, vol. ii. p. 357. 1862.

[2] Melville's exact words are: "Bot she was ernest with me to declaire quhilk of them I thocht fairest. I said, sche was the fairest Quen in England, and ours the fairest Quen in Scotland." (*Memoirs*, published in 1683.) Grahame, therefore, follows the original very closely here, but, with regard to the tragedy as a whole, he disclaims having paid a scrupulous attention to dates or facts.

series of episodes in the life of the Queen, such as the flight from Lochleven, the defeat of Langside and the imprisonment at Lancaster, which are strung together without cohesion or definite purpose. George Douglas is the hero, and he plays a far more important part in the tragedy than history warrants. There is a chivalrous desire all through to do justice to Mary, but he puts into her mouth long, and rather tedious speeches, which it is unlikely she would ever have uttered. The subject was, in fact, too vast for Grahame, and yet after all it is not surprising that he did not succeed where so many have failed.

The year of Bonaparte's threatened invasion of England, 1803, found Grahame and other Edinburgh advocates enrolled in a company of riflemen, and the poet commemorated Nelson's victory in some verses, entitled, "The Thanksgiving off Cape Trafalgar." The state of the Scottish capital was then much the same as when the Pretender was encamped outside its walls in the '45, and is thus described by Lord Cockburn: "We were all soldiers one way or other. Professors wheeled in the College area; the side arms and the uniform peeped from behind the gown at the bar, and even on the bench; and the parade and the review formed the staple of men's talk and thoughts."[1] In the previous year Grahame had married a lady of the same name, the daughter of the town clerk of Annan, and he soon discovered that his wife thought little of his poetry. All we know about her is that she is said, in the polite language of an earlier date, to have been a woman of "masculine understanding and very elegant accomplishments," and she persistently discouraged his attempts. What he had already written was by no means contemptible, and Mrs. Grahame, in thus endeavouring to thwart him, hardly appears to have treated him with sufficient consideration. At all events, he decided in 1804 to publish *The Sabbath* anonymously, and to avoid letting his wife know about it, he used to meet his printer clandestinely, at out-of-the-way coffee houses, where he corrected the proofs.[2] When it came out, he returned home one day to find her in raptures over it. "Ah, James," she exclaimed, "if you could but produce a poem like this." His pleasure may be easily imagined, and he no longer hesitated to own its authorship. The outside world was enthusiastic, and three new editions were called for within the year. Byron alone scoffed, and attacked him in his *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*, in which he also refers to some of Grahame's subsequent works:

> "Moravians rise! bestow some meet reward
> On dull Devotion—lo! the Sabbath Bard,

---

[1] *Memorials of His Time*, p. 187. 1856.
[2] *The Scottish Nation*, by W. Anderson, vol. ii. p. 358. 1862.

Sepulchral Grahame, pours his notes sublime
In mangled prose, nor e'er aspires to rhyme,
Breaks into blank the Gospel of St. Luke,
And boldly pilfers from the Pentateuch;
And, undisturbed by conscientious qualms,
Perverts the Prophets and purloins the Psalms."

That is bad enough, but the poet thought that he had not been sufficiently satirical, for with studied insult he added in an explanatory note: "Mr. Grahame has poured forth two volumes of cant, under the names of *Sabbath Walks* and *Biblical Pictures.*" This satire was published when Byron had only just come of age, but he expressed no regret to Grahame at a later date for his youthful outburst.

The profusion of historical illustration is a conspicuous feature of Grahame's verse, and he strongly condemns Jacobite oppression. The Lord Advocate, Sir George Mackenzie of Rosehaugh, comes in for some of his severest strictures, and it is perhaps natural that he should have regarded Claverhouse as the bloodthirsty tyrant, the eager instrument of his despotic master James, "this dastardly murderer of the unarmed peasantry," as he calls him, considering the intensity of his convictions, and his aversion to anything that savoured of persecution. He accepts such doubtful authorities as Peden and Wodrow in their entirety, and quotes at length from them in his notes. The absurd fictions connected with the death of John Brown of Priesthill, to whom Grahame refers, have been amply disproved, and we cannot resist the inference from the facts now known to us that his execution was lawfully carried out.[1] He was no mere passive Nonconformist, as Grahame would have us believe, for stores of arms were found in his possession when arrested, and he refused to take the oath of loyalty put to him. The poet claimed no kinship with the Claverhouse Grahams; but we may be sure that no ties of family, had they existed, would have hindered his religious scruples. Mistaken as he was as to Dundee's true character, there can be no question of the sincerity of the Whig principles to which he gave active adherence in his lifetime. Lord Cockburn, whilst admitting that he was "a child in simple poetry and amiable piety," places him in the front rank with such protagonists as John Macfarlan and James Moncreiff. "These three, indeed, would have made the best martyrs I have ever known. Moncreiff would have gone to the stake refuting his persecutor's errors; Macfarlan smiling inwardly and speculating on the oddity of the proceeding as a method of convincing; and Grahame, roused into indignation, proclaiming the atrocity of the tyrant."[2] He gives full scope to this stern anger in his poem, contrasting the

[1] *John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount of Dundee.* By Professor C. S. Terry. 1905, *passim.*
[2] *Memorials of His Time*, p. 260. 1856.

hardships which the Covenanters endured for conscience' sake with the peacefulness of Sabbath worship in his own day.

But Grahame is at his best when he turns aside from bygone religious controversy to describe the characteristic features of Scottish scenery, the wood and the wild, the mountain and the glen. The opening lines of *The Sabbath* are remarkable for the simplicity and purity of their style:—

> "How still the morning of the hallowed day!
> Mute is the voice of rural labour, hushed
> The ploughboy's whistle, and the milkmaid's song.
> The scythe lies glittering in the dewy wreath
> Of tedded grass, mingled with fading flowers,
> That yester-morn bloomed waving in the breeze:
> Sounds the most faint attract the ear,—the hum
> Of early bee, the trickling of the dew,
> The distant bleating, midway up the hill.
> Calmness sits throned on yon unmoving cloud.
> To him who wanders o'er the upland leas,
> The blackbird's note comes mellower from the dale;
> And sweeter from the sky the gladsome lark
> Warbles his heaven-tuned song; the lulling brook
> Murmurs more gently down the deep-worn glen;
> While from yon lowly roof, whose curling smoke
> O'ermounts the mist, is heard, at intervals,
> The voice of psalms, the simple song of praise."

If this high standard of excellence had been maintained throughout the poem, it might justly be regarded as a masterpiece. As it is, there are many other passages, which reveal his sympathy with nature and his simple faith, as where he depicts the blind man wandering in the woods familiar to his touch, the shepherd boy watching from the heights the straggling band of worshippers returning homewards, or the castaway on the desert island listening in imagination to the chimes of his native village church. The sentiment is never forced, but flows freely from his pen, and there is a peculiar strain of melancholy pervading the descriptive portions, which is relieved now and then by the poet's fiery outbursts against certain social evils crying for remedy, the misfortunes of debtors, the slave trade, the horrors of war, the selfishness of the rich. Grahame has been compared to Cowper on account of his devoutness, but he seems to have more affinity with his contemporary, Crabbe. They each took Anglican Orders, and had special opportunities for observing the lives of the very poor in rural districts. The realism of the Aldeburgh poet is somewhat depressing at times, and he does not spare us the minutest details, as where in *The Village*, for instance, he portrays "the poor laborious natives of the place," the squalor of their surroundings and the hopelessness of their lot. Grahame touches on such miseries with a lighter hand, but at the same time he is aglow with feeling, and the burden of

poverty must have pressed heavily upon him, for his chief delight in the first day of the week was that it is "the poor man's day" when the toiler's labour ceased for a time, and he was free to enjoy the pleasures which the country afforded him. In his *Sabbath Walks* he further developes this theme, and dwells upon the different aspects of meadow or stream during the changing seasons of the year. Two of his longer poems, *The Birds of Scotland* (1806) and *British Georgics*[1] (1809) are somewhat similar in character, but they did not meet with quite the same success.

The summer of 1807 he spent at Roslin, where at the request of a London publisher he wrote an elaborate poem on the abolition of the slave trade, which was printed in one volume with James Montgomery's *West Indies* to celebrate the event. Two years later he went to London, and was ordained by Dr. Bathurst, Bishop of Norwich, on Trinity Sunday, thus fulfilling the desire he had long cherished to take Holy Orders.[2] The Bishop wished him to remain in the diocese, but, as he suffered much from rheumatism, he was advised to accept a curacy at Shipton Moyne in Gloucestershire. There he remained until 1810, when he returned to Edinburgh to attend to certain family affairs. At that time there was a vacancy in St. George's Chapel, York Place, for which he was an unsuccessful applicant, and which was apparently the reward of supreme merit. This much we gather from the witty Mrs. Grant, of Laggan, who, writing under date 21 May to a Glasgow correspondent, tells her how she went with many other curious persons "to see and hear the amiable, poetical, sabbatical, and one anti-prelatical James Grahame, reading the Litany in a surplice, fearless alike of the ghosts of John Knox and Jenny Geddes, but rather apprehensive, I should suppose, of the keen inspection of his brother advocates and writers." She seems rather surprised that Grahame should have been so bold as to wish to have the bar and the kirk, which some imagined he had capriciously deserted, staring him in the face every day. The sermon she thought "a very amiable discourse delivered with grace and simplicity," but she found fault with his text.

In August of this year he went to St. Margaret's, Durham, where he obtained a great reputation for eloquence, and drew crowds to hear him. He was then transferred to Sedgefield in the same diocese, from which place he wrote to a friend that he was "excessively ill with severe and almost unceasing headaches." After

[1] There is a very favourable notice of this poem in the *Edinburgh Review*, vol. xvi. p. 213. *The Birds of Scotland* is happily named. Curiously enough, Grahame seems to have been in doubt as to the title, and a pedantic writer in the *Edinburgh Annual Register* (1812) confesses that he recommended "Caledonian Ornithology" to him, which would certainly have damped the sale, and which the author had the good sense not to adopt.

[2] *Vide* also the lines in *The Sabbath* commencing

"Nor would I leave unsung
The lofty ritual of our sister land," &c.

this his health completely broke down; he managed, however, to make the journey to Scotland, and reached his brother's residence at Whitehill, near Glasgow, where he died on September 14, 1811, leaving his widow and three children. An account of his last moments is given by Mrs. Grant in a letter to her son, Duncan, then stationed at Bombay, from which it appears that she had sent him a copy of Grahame's poems some time before: "I had an hour of pleasant, indeed, cheerful, conversation with him three days before his death. I sat with his wife at his bedside, and the recollection of the past seemed to animate and delight him." Another friend, Professor Wilson, published at the end of the year some impassioned lines to his memory in a small volume, which witness to his devotion to the man and his admiration for his works.

Grahame's principal attribute is his religious fervour. Every writer of importance we have quoted mentions his "amiability," but, apart from their testimony, his personality can only be constructed from his published works, for he apparently left no letters or journals behind him. He simply wrote as the spirit moved him, and he made no attempt to polish his verses. Indeed, the absence of any striving after effect is their chief merit. He was preeminently a preacher, and, as Lord Cockburn hints, he must have been a political force to be reckoned with in his day. Many of his shorter poems originally appeared in the press, and this mode of expression came as naturally to him as the pulpit. Save where his sense of wrong and injustice gets the better of his poetic instinct, his lines run as smoothly as one of the murmuring streams he was so fond of describing. There was nothing morose or gloomy about him, and Byron's ungenerous sneer at the "Sabbath Bard, Sepulchral Grahame," was entirely wide of the mark. In society he was the most cheerful companion, and numbered amongst his intimate acquaintances, North, Jeffrey, Brougham, and Francis Horner. The idea of loneliness satisfied him, because it was then that nature fully revealed herself to him, when the grasshopper's chirp, or the buzz of the moss-entangled bee, or the sudden rushing of the minnow shoal was distinctly heard and seen. It was probably this power of putting into the simplest language the every-day aspects of country life that made his friend Mrs. Grant exclaim: "Never was a purer or gentler mind than his, never poet more beloved," for he told of things whose appeal to mankind was universal.

GEORGE A. SINCLAIR.

ETHICS AS A NATURAL SCIENCE.

Though Ethics has engaged the attention of the greatest intellects of every age, we are as far as ever from having placed even the least important of its principles beyond controversy. It is not too much to say that Ethics approached from the metaphysical side has so far proved barren. Attempts to deal with the subject, again, from a scientific point of view have suffered from their being carried on too much on subjective lines, and there is probably room for another attempt to approach these problems from the direction of natural science.

It is impossible within the brief limits of this paper to discuss adequately all the principles that form the basis of such a system of Ethics. It will, therefore, be necessary to make certain explicit assumptions. The exigencies of brevity, moreover, will give an appearance of dogmatism to many statements, which, though they form the starting-points of Ethics, are the result of speculation or research in other departments of knowledge.

Natural law is essentially a uniformity in our experience, and to explain in the scientific sense is to reduce a less general uniformity to a case of a more general uniformity previously known.

The naturalistic view of Ethics assumes that such laws are never suspended or inoperative, though their effects may escape notice. For instance, we cannot trace the law of gravitation in the workings of the mind; yet it is not inconceivable that the order and sequence are in some way determined by it. This assumption of the continuity of natural law involves no assumption with regard to ultimate problems. Even after we have unified the whole of our objective experience and reduced it to terms of matter and energy, we are not yet on the threshold of the fundamental questions as to how experience itself is possible, the relation of subject to object, &c. We should have gone a long way in the interpretation of experience, but the nature of matter and energy, and their relation to the knowing subject, would be mysteries still.

Nature in process of evolution exhibits a progressive complexity of phenomena. Inorganic matter as treated of in molar physics is found to be subject to laws that are relatively few and simple. If the same cannot be said of molecular physics, this is due largely

to the difficulties of direct observation, the lack of which cannot be supplied by any amount of ingenious hypothesis.

With the appearance of organic life we meet with fresh complications, which at present are irreducible to the primitive laws of matter. But biology as a science postulates that its facts are capable of explanation, that is, of reduction to more general uniformities. These, so far as our present knowledge leads us to expect, can be no other than physical.

With the development of the higher forms of organic life, culminating in man with his elaborate nervous system, we reach a further stage of complication. Conscious thought and reason seem absolutely new elements introduced into the problem. But here again investigation has been able to trace in some degree the physical basis of mental action, and the attention devoted to physiological psychology promises further progress in this direction.

Lastly, the formation of societies or communities of individuals presents yet another sphere of phenomena. It is generally admitted that these phenomena, if capable of scientific treatment at all, must rest upon the laws that regulate individual conduct; and the sciences of sociology, politics, economics, &c., must work back to Ethics and biology.

Now, the chief characteristic of the naturalistic view is that each of the latter groups of sciences is regarded as founded upon those that precede it; that no new element is introduced in the later stages; that psychical and social phenomena are determinate, and differ from physical only in their extreme complexity. If we accept this view, then it will appear that Ethics has no closer connection with metaphysics than chemistry has; for metaphysics deals only with ultimate questions, and, *ex hypothesi*, there are no ultimate questions in Ethics.

The facts with which Ethics is concerned can now be stated more definitely. The conduct of individuals, so far as it affects other individuals directly or indirectly, both as regards its causes and its results, must come within the scope of the science, and our endeavour must be to discover any uniformities existing in the ways that men act or in the feelings excited by such actions. In other words, the subject-matter embraces both actions and moral judgments.

I shall assume that both alike are founded upon feelings and instincts, and thus a large part of our task will be to explain how human beings come to be endowed with particular feelings and instincts. One advantage of regarding Ethics as concerned primarily with feelings and instincts is that we are enabled to follow the comparative method, and draw part of our material from the lower animals, where the complicating effects of reason are eliminated.

If we agree to treat volition as based on feeling and instinct rather than on reason, we are relieved from the task of finding a rational sanction for conduct, a task that proved a stumbling-block to the early utilitarians, who were hampered, moreover, by their non-acquaintance with the laws of evolution. A system of morals founded on reason leaves no room for growth or development; for so long as men reason correctly, and from the same starting-point, we cannot admit the possibility of variation or progression without denying the validity of reason, and thus, so to speak, committing intellectual suicide. The search for a rational sanction commits us to an absolute and stationary system of morals from which any departure is abnormal, a view in striking contradiction to results reached by careful observation. The moment we abandon the idea of an absolute moral criterion and a moral sanction arrived at by reason, we are free to treat the subject-matter from an objective standpoint, and, instead of adapting or distorting facts to fit our theories, we accept in a proper scientific spirit whatever results emerge.

The recognition of an exact correspondence between conduct and the emotional and sentient side of character simplifies the problem, for it brings the latter into closer contact with the results of psychology and biology generally.

An individual in his actions follows what is for him the line of least resistance, but what that line is depends on a thousand circumstances, physiological and historical, more or less difficult to ascertain. By widening our area of observation so as to eliminate individual variations, we become aware of certain common characters which are something more than a mere average or algebraic sum of individual characters, a kind of moral or social medium, in which the individual is suspended, from which he takes on a certain colour, and which carries on the traditions of one generation to the next. Any theory of morals which neglects this social medium or matrix, and finds in the individual a moral microcosm, is of doubtful value.

The main question may be conveniently divided into three stages. (*a*) *Psychological.* We have firstly to classify and describe the different instincts and feelings from which our actions spring, noting their effect on conduct and their varying strength in different individuals. (*b*) *Historical.* We have next to determine the prevailing balance of these impulses in different times and places, and the consequent types of conduct that mark each age and people. (*c*) *Sociological.* Lastly, it is necessary to account for, or find the law of, the gradual change in the relative strength of these impulses, the steady subordination of some and the increasing ascendancy of others.

(*a*) The usual division of impulses has been into egoistic and

altruistic, but this division belongs more to the subjective methods of treatment, and cannot be made to throw much light on the problems of positive ethics. Every impulse is so far egoistic that we have more satisfaction in obeying than in disobeying it, provided no stronger impulse carries us in the opposite direction. If we accept the view that conduct is determined by feeling, then our actions under any given circumstances must be such as afford us the maximum of satisfaction. This seems like maintaining the familiar paradox that self-sacrifice is an impossibility. The reason is that the idea of self-sacrifice is borrowed from the subjective systems, and, like most other subjective views, serves only to confuse objective problems. If a mother gives food to her child instead of eating it herself, she does so because the maternal instinct is stronger than the feeling of hunger; and, this being so, there seems little question that such conduct affords her more satisfaction than the gratification of her hunger. It is only by limiting the meaning of the word "satisfaction" that we can escape this conclusion.

It is more convenient to divide our instincts into those directed to the preservation of the individual, and those directed to the preservation of the race. This does not correspond with the familiar division into egoistic and altruistic. The sexual instinct, for example, cannot be looked upon as altruistic, since the individual in yielding to it aims directly at his own gratification. The ultimate result, however, is to further the preservation of the race rather than of the individual. Thus it would seem better to class the sexual instinct along with the parental, though the one is distinctly egoistic, the other altruistic.

(*b*) One of the striking features of the higher forms of animal life is the strength of the sexual and the parental instincts, and, of course, natural selection furnishes a complete explanation of their universal prevalence. The advent of man and the development of the higher forms of civilisation have done little to strengthen those already powerful instincts. But when we turn to the wider social instincts we find an important change. There is manifested everywhere a steady growth of the feelings and instincts directed to the preservation of the society, such as benevolence, sympathy, &c. At the same time we can discern a widening of the sphere within which such feelings are effective. At first the social feelings are limited to the family or the tribe; then they extend to the nation, displaying themselves in those striking acts of patriotism that brighten even the darkest pages of history; lastly, there emerges that spirit of broad cosmopolitanism which has for its end the welfare of humanity.

(*c*) When we come to the question how an individual comes to possess impulses which make for the preservation of the society rather than his own, we find ourselves concerned with the main

problem of Ethics and of Social Evolution. The recognition of natural selection as the main principle of evolution seems at first to render moral progress more of a mystery than ever. For as long as we are dealing with the survival of the individual only, it is clear that the possession of altruistic impulses must be detrimental to him, and tend to handicap him in no small degree. In short, the action of natural selection on individuals must be to render them as egoistic as possible, and, indeed, we may observe in actual life that the successful men are often the most selfish and least scrupulous. With this force constantly tending to eliminate the unselfish, how does it come about that men are getting less selfish, and that the social and benevolent impulses become more prominent in each successive stage of civilisation?

Side by side with the selection of individuals there goes on a selection of aggregates of individuals, setting up opposing tendencies, and favouring that process of integration that renders social progress possible. This aspect of evolution has been dealt with by a number of writers, and particularly by Mr. Benjamin Kidd; but most of those have erred in taking the race or the nation as the aggregate on which natural selection operates. The extermination or supplanting of one race by another could hardly serve as an adequate explanation of human progress. During the last five centuries such a process has almost ceased in Western Europe, and yet it is precisely in this region, and during this period, that progress has been most rapid. We must look for some force that acts more continuously and strongly than the rivalry of nations or races; we must look for some influence within the nation itself that would ensure a certain rate of development even though that nation were isolated from all others.

A homogeneous state of society, in which each individual is related to each other individual by exactly similar ties, could never come into existence; or, if it did, could never endure. To use Spencer's term, such a state is unstable, and a community inevitably resolves itself into a collection of groups, upon which natural selection operates, the more powerfully in proportion to the degree of integration that each group displays. These groups or aggregates are not mutually exclusive, but may overlap or even cover each other in a multitude of ways. In relation to his family, his circle of friends, his trade, his church, each individual is a member of a more or less well-defined aggregate, all of which offer advantages varying as the devotion of the units composing them. The effect of each of these on an individual's chance of survival is small, but their sum may be appreciable. The effect, moreover, is continuous, neither limited to periods of actual war and conquest, nor dependent on any deliberate attempts at suppression such as Mr. Kidd points to in the case of the negro question in the States.

It is possible to conceive a group in which each of the members is actuated by purely selfish motives, and takes no account of the interests of the others, except so far as not to forfeit his claim to their help. This calculating selfishness is fairly widespread. But clearly the groups in which the proportion of such members is small would be able in a far higher degree to realise for each and all the advantages that combination and mutual help offer. A man in whom the social feelings are strong is more likely to be a member of such groups, and, *ceteris paribus*, has a better chance in life than one who is lacking in such feelings.

The problem of conduct, then, resolves itself into a question of the balance of the various feelings and impulses, and we are relieved of those perplexing puzzles of "the highest good," "conscience," "moral sanction," "the categorical imperative," &c. The failure of the older utilitarianism was to find a satisfactory explanation of how men came to act in any other than a selfish way. To know what is right is, after all, no reason why we should do what is right when our own personal interest points in another direction. But broadly interpreted the theory furnished a satisfactory criterion of conduct that excites a feeling of disapprobation or resentment in the onlookers. Here, again, the agency of natural selection must operate in correcting and strengthening that tendency to approve or to reprobate conduct, according as it is seen to promote or hinder the welfare of the community. People in whom such perceptions are keen and exact provide a more congenial medium for the social impulses to develop, and we may expect that natural selection will turn this to the advantage of the possessors.

If, then, the elimination of reason from the fundamental problems of Ethics is justifiable, the conditions are so far simplified that a coherent system of Ethics becomes possible. Such a system will be based partly on the older utilitarianism, and partly on the results of more recent sociological science. The metaphysical element becomes unimportant, almost negligible, and we may hope to see a science of Ethics in the real sense of the term.

W. M. LIGHTBODY.

SHOULD THE INDIVIDUAL BE SACRIFICED TO THE FAMILY?

So many things that were formerly believed to be private rights have been of late years translated into public wrongs, that it is becoming more and more apparent that the family is the last stronghold of individuality. Extreme socialists have long foreseen it as an insurmountable obstacle in the path of a triumphant communism. And it is clear that everywhere a criticism growing daily more severe is being directed upon that hitherto inviolate circle. The tendency of the present century is to throw the emphasis on the child as representing the race, rather than on the individuals who are primarily concerned in the marriage contract. In this way has the pendulum swung back from the ideas of the previous age, when the individualistic standpoint was the only one considered. And—as is the way of pendulums when uncontrolled—it is apt to land its followers in an extreme such as blurred with folly the Republic of the wise Plato. Only the man who holds an even balance between the active and the contemplative life is able to perceive that the highest good of both is incapable of divorce.

Most of the clamour of to-day arises from the region of the Courts. And the records of divorce certainly seem to exhibit, if not the failure of the ideal, at least an appalling departure from it in regard to practice. Small wonder that Eastern moralists cast scorn on the Christian ideal of marriage as inferior to polygamy, not only for the individual but for the race. Of course, it is not hard to confound these decriers of monogamy by a brief reference to the history of their own nations. Biologists agreed long ago that this was a state of decadence tending to moral and physical degeneracy in the race that practices it. And the most cursory observer of Eastern life is aware of the evil effects on the individual.

But to the nation anxious over the statistics of its births appears an *advocatus diaboli* much more subtle, who professes to ascribe the lessening number of marriages and births to the freedom and knowledge granted to children in their upbringing. "The French," says this upholder of ignorance, "manage these things better. With

them parentage is supreme. The family is a unit that exists for the welfare of the child. Consequently, instead of unseemly discord, ending in divorce and ruin, we have the spectacle of happy homes, where each seeks not his own pleasure but the welfare and prosperity of the circle of which he forms a part. It is the altruistic ideal, and a decided advance in civilisation upon the individualistic theory pursued by English-speaking races."

This is a large claim, and one which any one who regards the character and prosperity of his nation cannot afford to neglect.

The French ideal of the family is undoubtedly based upon the patriarchal system. It is, in fact, the theory under which our forefathers lived, and no one can deny that it had its virtues. Some of these have almost been lost sight of in the democratic eagerness after equality. Many people—looking on this phase of life as it lies in the golden haze of distance with which bygone years exaggerate their virtues and minimise their discomforts—are prone to crave for it as a simpler and truer ideal, compared with the apparent confusion of modern theories. But life progresses ever from the simple to the complex, and the wise man knows that the confusion of the present is but the greater simplicity of the future in process of evolution. Fortunately, such cravings for past ideals are, as a rule, but momentary expressions of wearied swimmers in the inexorable tide of human progress. But where they take hold of the imagination to any extent they are liable to retard the advance of the race for a time at least. The inherently false conception of life that lies at the root of all such attempts at retrogression is the same. It is the extreme of conservatism; the attempt to shut a creature of unknown powers within the limits of the known; the substitution of prudence for wisdom in the conduct of the affairs of life.

Old Wisdom sits upon the heights watching with calm, far-seeing eyes the countless streams that rush to the valley bringing freshness and fertility in their train. Prudence, with close-held skirts and short-sighted eyes, in alarm at the noise of the waters, gathers her heaps of stones to form a dam, lest the valley be overwhelmed by its rivers. How can she see that nature has prepared a path where it can journey safely to the mother sea, leaving only blessing in its track?

Now it is just this substitution of prudence for wisdom which characterises the French ideal of the family. The young Frenchman and woman are trained to believe it a duty to subdue all natural inclination in regard to the choice of conjugal relations, and accept the partner chosen for them by another individuality. No matter with what wise care and consideration for their happiness the selec-

tion has been made, the choice is vitiated by the fact that it is not theirs. Not only has the spiritual meaning of the relationship for them been thereby ignored, but they have been relieved of a primal responsibility of manhood and womanhood. What, meanwhile, becomes of the natural instincts unnaturally suppressed unhealthy French fiction professes to show. Unquestionably those races which have practised polygamy have been exclusively those which also limited the choice of the individual in the conjugal relation and exalted paternal authority. There can be little doubt that polygamy is the direct result of interference with individual freedom of choice in regard to marriage. Moreover, the abdication of personal responsibility in the matter must affect the whole attitude of family life. It becomes exclusively prudential. There is no room within its narrow limits for the unexpected and the humanly unforeseen. It is an attempt to abolish the element of uncertainty in regard to the future which is absolutely essential to progress in life. Who would be able to feel an interest in his life, or to strive hopefully if he knew surely that

"All the to-morrows should be as to-day?"

Surely the scientific discoveries in the line of evolution have at least established the fact that the proper keynote of human life is expectancy. If this is wanting there is no spring in the spirit that will lead to any great or worthy effort. It is all very well to sneer at romance, and attribute most of the disasters of life to its agency, but the most matter-of-fact person is indebted to the feeling that inspires it for his early growth, even if he has discarded it in maturity. It is the child's wonder at the world and eager outstretch towards the future that makes the impulse of his growth. Without it his hold on life would be feeble indeed, and his mental and physical development insignificant if not absolutely impossible. In like manner this element of romance supplies the germ of life-interest to the mature man and woman. No matter how sordid and narrow his life may grow in the struggle for existence, the "shades of the prison-house" cannot entirely shut him in so long as this daily-growing wonder of soul-revelation in another nature is his by right of love. And no mere affection, dictated by "community of interests," can supply the place of it. He may mistake its leading, and in consequence "sup sorrow by spoons full." His nature may be embittered, perhaps hardened, by a choice which to all others appears the height of folly; but at least he will have had his human opportunities. He will have had the germ of happiness and spiritual development in his own keeping.

And there is no doubt that this atmosphere, charged to the full with spiritual potencies, makes the only fitting environment for

the child-life. The tender soul-germ is warped and hardened and often cheated of its happiness and the best possibilities of its future by less sympathetic surroundings. Much has been said of the disastrous effects of ill-considered marriages on the youth of the race, of children torn between disunited parents, and the condition of such is undeniably pitiful. But who shall attempt to enumerate the loss to the individuals and to the race by reason of the deadly closeness of the atmosphere of a marriage of convenience in which they were reared? A child may hold his faith and his ideals in spite of many a storm by which he suffers, for storms are not unknown in nature's economy, but how shall he be trained towards the higher reaches of the moral life in a home which is built on the sacrifice of truth to physical comfort and prosperity? And it is the withholding of these opportunities of development that constitute the crime against the race that the advocates of such a system contemplate. One cannot blame the Frenchmen for the pride with which he points to the peace and contentment which he calls happiness at his hearth, due, as he believes, to the subordination of the individual to the family, but neither can the listener be blamed for looking beyond that fireside to its results on the race.

Few Anglo-Saxons realise to what extent this prudential theory has influenced the birth-rate in France. And every biologist knows that disability lies always in the track of habit. In spite of foundling hospitals and abundant facilities for getting rid of unwelcome infants in more humane fashion than by the Chinese method of exposure, France is unable to expand into colonies to any extent. Surely a time when even the world-spreading Anglo-Saxon is beginning to cry out against race-suicide is not well chosen for advocating a theory of the family based solely upon prudence. The larger view—which sees in the natural attraction of one individual for another the wise provision of a Creator who held cognisance of the race as well as the individual, when He said "for this cause shall a man leave father and mother and cleave unto his wife"—will not be likely to imagine that a family must be limited by the narrow bounds of a visible family treasury. He is but a shallow observer who accuses nature of waste. A mind alive to her infinite outlook sees all around him evidences that

> "As brute and bird do, reptile and the fly,
> Ay and, I nothing doubt, even tree, shrub, plant
> And flower of the field (are), all in a common pact
> To worthily defend the trust of trusts,
> Life from the Ever Living."

No scheme which limits the development of the individual is wide enough for the expansion of the race. Interfere with the respon-

sibility of individual choice and you shut your eyes to the vision of a race God-guided to a divinely foreseen height of character and attainment: henceforth you must be content with a provincial ideal of material comfort, strictly limited, and doomed to extinction in family and nation before the measureless thirst for good which is the motive of all human development.

Elmina L. Sutherland.

A MODERN INSTANCE OF UNCONSCIOUS PROPHECY.

It is being increasingly felt that the old conception of the nature of prophecy needs to be modified. Formerly men believed that even details comparatively trivial, concerning things to come, were made known to the prophets, and were proclaimed by them centuries beforehand. To many Christains nowadays there seems a want of dignity in such a conception: it lowers the prophet almost to the level of the magician and the soothsayer; nor is it easy to see what merit there can be in recognising such details when the event foretold comes to pass, since it calls for no higher quality than a certain intellectual sharpness and ingenuity. This it is, indeed, which makes so many of the past commentaries on the Prophets such unprofitable reading: the cleverness displayed too much resembles that of one who is good at the solution of riddles; the explanations are ingenious rather than ingenuous, and neither call for nor exhibit any moral perception. We are beginning now, however, to see that the inspiration of the prophet was above all a moral inspiration; he saw further than other men because he saw deeper. Living on a higher spiritual plane than his contemporaries he drew ideal pictures of what men and societies might and should be; and as religion triumphed and spirituality increased there came an approximation to this ideal, and the prediction was in part fulfilled. This explains much in prophecy that is perplexing. It explains, for instance, occasional incongruities. Whilst the prophet depicted scenes and characters of a moral beauty beyond the conception of his contemporaries, yet these were not necessarily, and in all respects, free from the immaturity of his time. Thus in some Messianic Psalm while nine-tenths of the verses may apply most marvellously to the person and office of Christ, the other tenth may depict some trait quite out of keeping with His character. It explains, also, the failure of the Pharisees to interpret their own Scriptures aright: for since prophecy reveals its meaning not to ingenuity but to moral insight, it is only the spiritual man who admires the moral beauty of the Prophets' pictures, and measures men and nations by their approximation to the true ideal.

Now if this account of the prophetic inspiration be true, or even partially true, the power of prophecy must be reckoned not as a

merely thaumaturgic, but as a spiritual gift, so that instances of its exercise ought to be forthcoming in modern times. And we should naturally look for such instances in the writings of the poets. The prophets were all poets; and though it cannot be said, conversely, that poets are all prophets, yet when a poet is possessed of a deeply spiritual nature, and dedicates his powers to the highest service, as Wordsworth, for instance, did, it ought not to surprise us to find a prophetic strain present in his writings. A prophet, in truth, Wordsworth was; not, indeed, largely in a predictive sense, for prediction is, at best, but a subordinate prophetic function—but in the higher sense of one who shows forth some new aspect of divine truth; for none will deny that Wordsworth has taught men to discern the presence of God in the natural world as no other has done. But it is my present purpose to show that on one occasion at least he rises into the predictive strain. In his "Character of the Happy Warrior" he sketched an ideal of which the world saw the living embodiment half a century later in the saintly General Gordon, and the correspondence between the poem and the life is so close, and so interesting as an illustration of the predictive element in the Hebrew writings, that it will be worth while to compare the two somewhat minutely.

The opening lines of the poem which are somewhat general, are not so startling in their application to our Christian hero as some other passages; but still they are sufficiently apposite. From the first Gordon was destined for the army, looked forward to this career as a matter of course, and prepared himself for it with painstaking diligence. The boy was father to the man. The little that is told us about his childhood reveals the same disposition as his public career discloses. His extraordinary modesty, for instance, was the same. When his mother praised one of his drawings and showed it with pride to a friend, the praise was so distasteful to the lad that he destroyed it forthwith; and in after years when it was thought right that an account of his Chinese campaign should be published, and Gordon after much pressure reluctantly consented to give information, he tore up page after page of the editor's work because it related to his own personal prowess. As regards his religious career also there was no violent break; we do not hear of any sudden conversion or spiritual crisis, but his days were "bound each to each" by personal piety. That the inner life was his chief concern, and that his high aims made his "path always bright," so that any enterprise he took in hand seemed a sacred task to which he was divinely commissioned—all this is sufficiently patent to every reader of his life. Now glance at the opening words of Wordsworth's beautiful poem.

> "Who is the happy Warrior? Who is he
> That every man in arms should wish to be?

—It is the generous spirit, who, when brought
Among the tasks of real life, hath wrought
Upon the plan that pleased his boyish thought:
Whose high endeavours are an inward light
That makes the path before him always bright:
Who, with a natural instinct to discern
What knowledge can perform, is diligent to learn;
Abides by this resolve, and stops not there,
But makes his moral being his prime care."

War was to Gordon both a school in which his virtues were disciplined and perfected, and a sphere in which those virtues found their most fruitful exercise. The frequent sight of suffering made his heart only the more tender, so that he who could lead a forlorn hope without a tremour, felt the sufferings of the least of God's creatures. Once, in the Soudan, having inadvertently injured a lizard's tail by switching his riding-whip, he was rendered miserable for days by the remembrance of it. At Woolwich he spent much time and care in trying to cure a canary belonging to a lady friend of his which had broken its leg. No man has written more feelingly of the horrors of war, or has more strongly denounced those who enter upon it with a light heart. To him it was a dreadful necessity, and nothing could justify its employment but the hope of putting an end to some evil greater still. When he quitted China he wrote to his mother "I know I shall leave China as poor as when I entered it, but with the knowledge that through my weak instrumentality upwards of eighty to one hundred thousand lives have been spared. I need no further satisfaction than this." His sole object in undertaking the administration of the Soudan was to put down the slave trade. "I declare solemnly," he says, "that I would give my life willingly to save the sufferings of these people, and if I could do this how much more does He care for them than such imperfection as I am." In all this he was still the Happy Warrior,

"Who doomed to go in company with Pain
And Fear and Bloodshed, miserable train!
Turns his necessity to glorious gain;
In face of these doth exercise a power
Which is our human nature's highest dower;
Controls them and subdues, transmutes, bereaves
Of their bad influence, and their good receives:
By objects which might force the soul to abate
Her feeling, rendered more compassionate."

Gordon's besetting sin was a certain hastiness of temper which was never entirely conquered, but that the thousand incitements to this infirmity which his marvellous career occasioned were made to contribute to self-mastery is quite apparent in his biography. In this also he shows himself true to Wordsworth's ideal. And no one can read his Journals written in the Soudan without seeing

that the trials of his faith disciplined his entire character. As the sight of suffering taught him compassion, so also his toils and anxieties taught him to endure hardness.

"No man ever had a harder task than I, unaided, have before me," he writes, "but it sits as a feather on me. . . . I have done with my comforts in coming here. My work is great, but does not weigh me down. I go on as straight as I can. I feel my own weakness, and look to Him who is Almighty, and I leave the issue, without inordinate care, to Him."

Scores of passages to this effect are to be found in his letters and journals. And who can think of these traits in our hero without being reminded of Wordsworth's description of the Happy Warrior as one who

> "Is placable—because occasions rise
> So often that demand such sacrifice;
> More skilful in self-knowledge, even more pure,
> As tempted more; more able to endure
> As more exposed to suffering and distress;
> Thence also more alive to tenderness."

And so as regards the lines

> "—'Tis he whose law is reason; who depends
> Upon that law as on the best of friends;
> Whence, in a state where men are tempted still
> To evil for a guard against worse ill,
> And what in quality or act is best
> Doth seldom on a right foundation rest,
> He labours good on good to fix, and owes
> To virtue every triumph that he knows."

as we read them, a hundred instances of Gordon's modesty, self-suppression, rectitude of aim, and singleness of mind present themselves to justify their application to his career.

But it is in the passage which follows that the most startling correspondence between the ideal and the real character is to be found. Every one remembers Gordon's liability to throw up his post at a moment's notice, but perhaps everyone does not know that this phenomenon was not a manifestation of caprice, but of settled principle. While at the head of ever-victorious army in China it was part of his deliberate purpose to set the orientals a constant example of mercy and truth. When contrary to his plighted word the captured Wangs or rebel chiefs were put to death Gordon promptly resigned, and only under great pressure and after satisfactory guarantees that his work would not again be undone did he resume command. When a war was threatened between Cape Colony and the Basutos, he, at that time commander of the Colonial forces, was sent on a mission to Basutoland, and being convinced by what he heard there that the Basutos were

substantially in the right, he promptly threw up his commission and stayed with the Basutos, trying to win them to keep the peace and to be true to the religion of Christ which they had embraced. So again when he went out to India as secretary to Lord Ripon, then Governor-General; he went with the hope that he should be useful. But he was disgusted with what he saw there. To a man of his high ideals the luxury, the self-seeking, the love of money, the contempt for native prejudices which he discerned in many of the British officials were infinitely painful. He longed to do something to remedy all the evil which he saw, and yet found that his hands were so bound with the red tape of officialism that he was powerless; and not even his respect for Lord Ripon could prevent him from promptly resigning. How forcibly by all these episodes are we reminded of the ideal Happy Warrior.

> "Who, if he rise to station of command
> Rises by open means; and there will stand
> On honourable terms, or else retire,
> And in himself possess his own desire."

Nor do I know of any man whose life, in its entire absence of self-seeking and the love of money more closely corresponds to the lines which follow those just quoted. In China he spent all his pay on the sick and wounded. When first appointed Governor-General of the Equatorial Province, he was offered £10,000 a year like his predecessor, but he would accept only £2000. When invited a second time to China to advise the Emperor in a crisis, and to re-organise the forces he was asked to state what pay he would accept, and sent back the characteristic telegram, "As to pay, Gordon is indifferent." At the Cape he accepted a sum less than half that which had been offered him; and wishing to recommend certain economies to the Colonial forces he set the example by reducing by one third his already reduced pay. And the absence of self-seeking was just as remarkable in him as his freedom from the love of money. After each of the remarkable episodes in his life he retired into complete seclusion, whence he only emerged at the pressing entreaties of others, and on occasions when he thought he saw some opportunity of serving God in his fellow men. No man more resolutely shunned fame, and no man's fame is more assured. In this respect also he was one with the Happy Warrior.

> "Who comprehends his trust, and to the same
> Keeps faithful with a singleness of aim;
> And therefore does not stoop, nor lie in wait
> For wealth, or honours, or for worldly state;
> Whom they must follow; on whose head must fall
> Like showers of manna if they come at all."

During those intervals, when not employed in great public enterprises, the ever-victorious general was employed, as is well known, in teaching neglected waifs in a ragged school, or ministering to the sick and dying in the hospitals or the slums; and so great was the love his gentle charity awakened in the hearts of the poor and sad, that his death many years after was felt by hundreds in the courts and slums of Woolwich as a personal bereavement. Only once did he address a public assembly, and that was an assembly of ragged children; only once did he allow himself to be the hero of a public meeting, and that was when the Sunday-school children presented him with a pocket Bible, and on that occasion he broke down and left the meeting with tears in his eyes. Speaking of the fact that the Sunday-school teachers at Gravesend did not know how great a man was in their midst, one who knew him for twenty years says: "But had they known it, it would have been impossible for them to have been overawed by his presence for he was as modest as a child." Truly

> "His powers shed round him in the common strife,
> Or mild concerns of ordinary life,
> A constant influence, a peculiar grace."

And we all know how true of Gordon are the lines which follow. We remember how, when called upon to undertake a superhuman task, to endeavour to accomplish single-handed that which armies had failed to do, he accepted the mission with a simple "Yes," and set out that same night for the Soudan. How serenely, when on his way, did he write to his friend in a country vicarage: "I am quite restored to my peace, thank God, and in His hand He will hide me. You and I are equally exposed to the attacks of the enemy, I not a bit more than you are." We remember his address to the Soudanese: "I come without soldiers, but with God on my side." And when God had shown him that not earthly success but martyrdom was to be his, we know that he was still serenely superior to his fortune: "I am quite happy, and, like Lawrence, I have tried to do my duty." Is not this, indeed, he whom Wordsworth foresaw, mild and modest in private life:

> "But who, if he be called upon to face
> Some awful moment to which Heaven has joined
> Great issues, good or bad for human kind,
> Is happy as a Lover; and attired
> With sudden brightness, like a man inspired;
> And, through the heat of conflict, keeps the law
> In calmness made, and sees what he foresaw;
> Or if an unexpected call succeed,
> Come when it will, is equal to the need."

Recall the affecting words he wrote to a lady when dangers were thickening round him at Khartoum: "How are little Julia and

Charlie? I hope, well, and as naughty as ever. I wish often I was back, quiet and full of delightful thoughts, instead of thinking evil of every one and not trusting our dear Lord"; and then resume the reading of our poem.

> "He who, though thus endowed as with a sense,
> And faculty for storm and turbulence,
> Is yet a Soul whose master-bias leans
> To homefelt pleasures and to gentle scenes;
> Sweet images! which, wheresoe'er he be,
> Are at his heart; and such fidelity
> It is his darling passion to approve
> More brave for this, that he hath much to love."

And so with the remaining lines. There is no need to comment on them. What has already been said, and what everybody knows of Gordon's life and character will show how fitly our great Christian hero's career answers the question, "Who is the happy Warrior?"

> "'Tis, finally, the man, who, lifted high,
> Conspicuous object in a Nation's eye,
> Or left unthought of in obscurity—
> Who, with a toward or untoward lot,
> Prosperous or adverse, to his wish or not,
> Plays, in the many games of life, that one
> Where what he most doth value must be won:
> Whom neither shape of danger can dismay,
> Nor thought of tender happiness betray;
> Who, not content that former worth stand fast,
> Looks foward, persevering to the last,
> From well to better, daily self-surpast:
> Who, whether praise of him must walk the earth
> For ever, and to noble deeds give birth,
> Or he must fall, to sleep without his fame,
> And leave a dead unprofitable name—
> Finds comfort in himself and in his cause;
> And, while the mortal mist is gathering, draws
> His breath in confidence of Heaven's applause:
> This is the happy Warrior; this is He
> That every man in arms should wish to be."

I have now quoted every line of "The Happy Warrior," and it is plain that both in its general drift and in its details it is clearly applicable to him whom we have considered as its antitype. It is equally clear that we might ransack ancient and modern history without finding another hero who would thus minutely correspond to Wordsworth's high ideal. Here, then, is a modern case of prophecy fully as wonderful, in one sense, as any to be found in the Old Testament. Supposing men were to treat it hereafter as men treat Biblical prophecy, what would happen? When, centuries hence, the chronology now distinct had become hazy, one class of critics would probably build up a really convincing argu-

ment that the poet and the hero were contemporaries, that Wordsworth *must* have been familiar with Gordon's career and must have had it in his mind's eye when the poem was written. An opposite school of critics would be busy in arriving at an equally false conclusion. We know—for Wordsworth himself has told us—that some traits of the Happy Warrior were borrowed from the character of Nelson, others from that of his own brother John. But the critics last mentioned, anxious to prove that this foreshadowing of Gordon was a pure piece of necromancy, would triumphantly ask—How could all the noble things in this writing apply to Nelson, an adulterer, a profane swearer, a man full of earthly infirmities? How could the picture of a warrior apply to John Wordsworth, captain of an East Indian ship, no soldier and not even an officer in the Navy? They would cover with ridicule those who suggested that these contemporaries of Wordsworth had anything to do with the inspiration of this prophecy. Both classes of critics, as we know, would be wrong. And is it not at least possible that those astute critics who assume that the Hebrew prophets always prophesied after or during the occurrence of the event, and those ingenious theologians who explain away everything in a prophecy that seems to be borrowed from the writer's own time, may be equally mistaken?

But if we take this modern instance for our guide we shall be kept, I think, from either extreme. Many of the prophecies of the Old Testament are just what this poem is, attempts to paint a true ideal, made by men of deep spiritual insight, under the impulse of the Holy Ghost. The prophets, for example, depict in many passages the supreme happiness which would result if their nation would but turn with all their heart to God; and by putting such passages side by side, we get a picture of the future Golden Age. The images employed are drawn from the events and persons of the prophets' own times; there have been partial fulfilments, consisting of only temporary approximations, on the part of one or other nation, to the state of holiness and happiness depicted by the prophets; but the ideal awaits for its full realisation that day when "all shall be kings and priests to God," when "men shall beat their spears into pruning-hooks and their swords into ploughshares," and when "the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea." Less happy than Wordsworth their dream has not yet clothed itself in actual facts.

The Messianic prophecies, on the other hand, have not been merely fulfilled but surpassed. Seers and prophets, having once learned to look forward to an ideal King and Saviour, each sought to depict that ideal in the fairest colours he could command, and their success or failure is the measure of their capacity for receiving the spiritual conceptions with which God would fain endow them.

Their images, too, were of necessity borrowed from their surroundings, and especially from the traits which they admired in the best and holiest of their kings. The analogy to be derived from Wordsworth's poem should guard us equally from denying the existence of these prototypes, and from believing that the prophetic picture was completely realised in them. Once accept this analogy, and it would not surprise us to find in the 110th Psalm, which our Lord Himself stamped as Messianic, and which is for the most part so wonderfully applicable to the Messiah's reign, a prediction that "he shall fill the places with dead bodies and cut in pieces the rulers over divers nations." Nor, on the other hand, shall we blindly maintain that to Hezekiah, and to Hezekiah alone were such epithets applicable as "Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." Nor will it surprise us to find undoubted Messianic passages embedded in a context which repels us. There is probably no prediction of the same length as the poem I am dealing with which will apply in so unforced and minute a manner to the Messiah, as Wordsworth's poem applies to Gordon. The reason is obvious. Christ, God incarnate, surpassed all human conception. No man was worthy to catch more than a partial glimpse of His glory, no prophet could fully foresee the grandeur of His moral beauty. As the little squares of gold and enamel which are pieced together by an artist to form the head of an angel or saint do not when separated suggest the artist's ideal, so neither do the Old Testament prophecies till they are brought together present a true image of the God Man. The theory deducible from Wordsworth's unconscious prophecy helps us to feel that without being irrational we may accept as prophecy whatever in Scripture points to Christ, and, without being irreverent, reject whatever in the context seems unworthy of Him. The adoption of such a theory would absolve the preacher from much strained exegesis, and would rid our commentaries of much special pleading which is rather a stumbling-block than a help to the candid inquirer.

ANGUS M. MACKAY.

STUDIES OF HAPPINESS.

I.

To say that the things best worth knowing are those least known to us is almost a truism, yet the strangeness of the fact is always striking us afresh, in whichever direction we look. If we are interested in fish or fowl, the habits of the mastodon, or the idiosyncrasies of the Ichthyosaurus, science is ready to supply us with a mass of information; but if we want to understand about ourselves and our place in the world, we find that we are asking riddles, to which answers—like Betsy Trotwood—are "not forthcoming".

Medical science, we are told, is still in the empirical stage, whilst mental science stands on the threshold of inquiry. As for our souls, there are many who do not even yet feel sure whether they have any or not, and for the rest, it is only those who have faith in the unknown, who know!

Just the same uncertainty prevails in the study of our present theme, Happiness.

The desire for happiness must have animated every human breast in every age, yet in spite of the centuries that have passed between the mysterious *then* of the beginning until now, how little we know about it, or understand how to attain it. The reason is no doubt because the subject is too vast to be viewed comprehensively without effort, and also the desire for it is such an integral part of ourselves and so inextricably knotted up with practical questions of ways and means, expectations, circumstances and persons—with the whole network of life in fact—that instead of examining it as a whole, most of us are content to think of it, as we experience it, in scraps and patches. Happiness falls like sunlight here and there upon our chequered lives, sometimes brightening them with the obvious joys of youth and love, health and prosperity; sometimes persistently eluding its most ardent votaries, or tainting the best gifts of life with some subtle flavour of bitterness; and sometimes also appearing in unexpected ways and places, where sorrow and suffering reign.

Altogether 'tis no wonder some people shake their heads dubiously and quote the well-known saying that he who seeks for happiness will never find it, whilst many others regard it as a transient and elusive boon which it is well that we should learn to do without.

If we look into the matter a little we perceive that much as people may differ as to the relationship which happiness bears, or ought to bear, to the individual, and as to the best mode of obtaining it, there is not much difference of opinion as to the meaning of the word itself, most people agreeing that happiness is the enjoyment of good; a state of felicity; the whole gamut of delight from ecstasy to simple peace of mind. True, there are a few unreflective persons here and there who insist on identifying it with what they call "mere" pleasure, not wholly disassociated in their minds with Sabbath-breaking; but they are a small minority, and as, according to Nuttal's Dictionary, to be happy means, among other things, "enjoying the presence and favour of God in a future life," it is clear that attempts to restrict the meaning of the word to any kind of temporal or material pleasure are quite out of order. Hence we naturally infer that happiness, the heart's desire, is also the rational and proper object of life. Happiness in the abstract, that is to say, but not necessarily all, or any particular form of it: we have only to look back upon our own lives to see how many things, pleasurable for the moment, end by disagreeing with our mental or physical health, and therefore indulgence in them does not contribute to the sum total of our happiness, and, in a word, we see that it is quite as easy to make mistakes in this matter as in any other. But whatever mistakes we may make, and whatever culpable weakness we may show, by indulging in pleasures which we know to be prejudicial to our welfare, we may still adhere to the belief that happiness is the legitimate object of every life, and ask with every show of reason "how is it possible not to desire felicity, or the enjoyment of good?" Yet we have no sooner placed ourselves in this unassailable position than we hear the answering cry, "There is something better than happiness," to which our hearts respond. Yes, there is something better than happiness, stronger than reason, and higher than felicity; namely, the love of purity, truth and righteousness. But then, we argue, is not this very love and pursuit of goodness just as much a method of seeking happiness as the pursuit of any worldly good—art for instance, or learning, for the sake of which people are often willing to sacrifice other things. The answer to this usually is, that however much people may sacrifice some things to others, in the pursuit of happiness, they never sacrifice themselves (a subtle difference), whereas saints and heroes do. They are made of sterner stuff, and do not stop to consider how much death at the stake, or torture, or dismemberment at the cannon's mouth will increase the sum total of their happiness either here or hereafter. St. Paul, for instance, did not consult his earthly welfare when he became the Apostle to the Gentiles, and if it had been revealed to him that no future bliss, or life even, could be his, would it have made any difference to his actions or his desire to save others. We

think not; nor is it probable that "other worldliness" has ever prompted nobler deeds than present worldliness has, though no doubt it has served as a useful curb to evil passions.

If we turn to Spencer's *Data of Ethics* we shall see the arguments in favour of regarding happiness as the object of life very clearly expressed. He points out that happiness must be our aim if life is to continue to exist, for he says:

"If we substitute for the word Pleasure, the equivalent phrase—a feeling which we seek to bring into consciousness and retain there, and if we substitute for the word Pain, the equivalent phrase—a feeling which we seek to get out of consciousness and to keep out; we see at once that, if the states of consciousness which a creature endeavours to maintain are the correlatives of injurious actions, and if the states of consciousness which it endeavours to expel are the correlatives of beneficial actions, it must quickly disappear through persistence in the injurious and avoidance of the beneficial."

But, of course, he does not mean that instinct or impulse should always be obeyed, because, as he further explains, "special and proximate pleasures and pains must be disregarded out of consideration for remote and diffused pleasures and pains." Finally, he tells that as man progresses in the scale of civilisation the conflicting aims of egotism and altruism grow nearer and nearer, less and less antagonistic, until, at last, they become co-essential. In the Appendix, alluding to the apparent difficulty of reconciling egotism and altruism, Mr. Spencer says: "There has from the beginning been arising, and has arisen more and more, to a higher and higher stage, such constitution in each creature as entailed egoistic gratification in performing the altruistic action." He points to family life as an example of this, showing that in the family self-sacrifice becomes pleasurable through affection, and from this he argues: "That which has been in course of achievement in respect of the limited group of beings constituting a family . . . is to a comparatively small extent achieved with those larger groups constituting societies."

With such reasoning as this it is hard to disagree, but at the same time we feel that it does not cover all the ground. For one thing, it deals with conduct itself rather than motive, and to admit that under certain circumstances egotism and altruism coalesce is not an admission that laudable conduct is necessarily occasioned by that consideration; on the contrary, it seems to us that those in whom the coalition is most complete are precisely those most willing to sacrifice self if it were not so.

Now let us glance at what has been written on the other side. In *The Emotions and the Will* Dr. Bain says: "So far as I am able to judge of our disinterested impulses, they are wholly distinct from the attainment of pleasure and the avoidance of pain. They

lead us, as I believe, to sacrifice pleasures and incur pains without any compensation; they positively detract from our happiness."

In *The Map of Life* Mr. Lecky says something very similar. "The conscience of mankind," he writes, "has ever recognised self-sacrifice as the supreme element of virtue, and self-sacrifice is never real when it is only the exchange of a less happiness for a greater."

Thus the matter stands, and it is no easy task to reconcile these conflicting opinions; philosophy will not help us, it seems, and if we are determined to solve the riddle we must turn for help to popular opinion and that oft-quoted person, "the Man in the Street." Here we find no formulas and no theories; nothing but the passive assumption that man has two selves, a higher and a lower, or, as it is more frequently expressed, two sides, a good one and a bad one. True, this dual self has only a metaphorical existence, and popular sentiment cannot explain its own notion; but, for all that, most of us believe that there is in each one of us a nebulous something beyond the every-day, obvious, egotistical and self-interested self. Consequently a great many phrases which sound ambiguous and contradictory are perfectly well understood; thus we hear of "disinterested labour," "unselfish enthusiasm," "the joy of self-sacrifice," and other cryptic or paradoxical sayings which, nevertheless, the wayfaring man understands, because he experiences within himself many a conflict, many a victory, and many a loyal surrender. If we permit ourselves to adopt this assumption, at all events provisionally, we shall see that it supplies a key to our present difficulty.

Let us begin again with the verdict of philosophy that happiness is the only rational object of life, since anything preferable to happiness must be something which affords greater happiness than happiness, which is absurd.

Be it so! But when we have admitted this fact without reserve it still remains for us to ask, "Whose happiness are we considering?" If our mental nature is dual, our objects of desire will be dual, and sometimes so directly in opposition that the satisfaction of the one side will necessitate the sacrifice of the other; therefore it is of importance to decide whether to regard the happiness of the higher or lower self as the rational object of life. Our choice, we perceive, is not one of degree, but of kind. That which offers a preponderance of pleasure overpaying to the lower self may be absolutely abhorrent to the higher, and *vice versa*, consequently the standard set by the higher nature will yield very different results from the one set by the lower. For instance, there are many cases in which the positive pleasure of some wrongful act quite outweighs the faint protests of conscience; therefore it is for the happiness of the lower self to act wrongfully, especially as the

protests of conscience are sure to grow fainter each time they are resisted. But if the happiness of the higher self is the object of life, then it is more comfortable to obey the dictates of conscience, and, in a word, matters of taste and matters of morality cannot be estimated by the same measure or weighed against each other.

Moreover, as Mr. Lecky says, "Self-sacrifice is never real when it is only the exchange of a less happiness for a greater one," and on the same ground common sense never regards the price which we pay for a thing as a sacrifice of self, because we obviously desire to possess the purchase more than the money. Therefore real self-sacrifice, or self-denial, only exists when it involves the sacrifice or the denial of the lower self *without compensation* to the demands and desires of the higher self. From this point of view two things become increasingly clear to us; first of all, we see why so many people will not admit that happiness is the proper object of life. It is because they jump to the conclusion that it is the happiness of the lower self that is meant—the mundane satisfaction of the possibly prudent and virtuous, but selfish personality. Therefore they declare that there is something more desirable than happiness, something which Carlyle called blessedness and which we call the happiness of the higher self.

The second thing which becomes clearer to us is the reason why the Epicureans necessarily degenerated whilst the Stoics did not, for if virtue (to sum up the higher qualities in one word) is recommended only because it conduces to the happiness of man as a whole, it stands to reason that many people will question whether so much virtue is agreeable to them on the whole, and incline to the belief the self-indulgence suits their tastes better.

On the other hand the Stoics and Ascetics generally, whilst we count them in error in supposing that serenity of mind or spiritual exaltation were not forms of happiness, were nevertheless fortunate in this, that they put their label so to speak on to the forms of happiness which appeal to the high self, and therefore succeeded in maintaining a lofty standard.

Hence the essential difference between the two schools of thought appears to be that in the one case the individual is left to choose what seems best to him, and in the other the choice is made for him. True, the enlightened Epicurean or Hedonist advises the practice of virtue, but he has no authority to enforce his personal opinions, and his pupils may always reply "that is true for you, but for me, a short life and a merry." But in the schools of austerity the teachers speak authoritatively, they claim to know what is best for their pupils; they do not tell them to consult their preferences but to strive after high things, and to acquire such tastes and virtues as are not inherent in them, assuring them that whether they like it or no, such conduct is for their welfare

and ultimate good. Thus they teach that the common good desired by all can only be reached by the rugged path of self-discipline and self-sacrifice and not by every pleasant road which seems to reach there. Thus far the dual self-supposition has been helpful, but we cannot accept it even as a working hypothesis until we have considered it more carefully. It is satisfactory to note that so far as mental science is concerned we are welcome to split the ego into as many parts as we like, since the disintegrations of the personality is one of its favourite problems; but what we require of this as of every hypothesis, before we can deem it workable, is that it shall be clear and definite. Now, the wayfaring man may be convinced of the existence of two sides to his nature, but he would be puzzled to say what was the scope of either, and he certainly could not point out where the one ended and the other began. Can we by taking thought do any better?

Let us begin by forming a clear conception of man as he is evolved by rational processes and positive science, in short of Herbert Spencer's man in whom altruism and egotism coalesce. He is, of course, a good citizen, possibly a good husband and father, and in all things he is just, scrupulous, and urbane, because enlightened self-interest make him so. But at best he lacks the motives which have kept less enlightened men and women pure and honourable long before altruism and egotism had so much as a bowing acquaintanceship. Moreover, the fact that his love and care for others is sanctioned if not dictated by self-interest, seems to rob the rose of its sweetness and brush the charm from all fair deeds of loving and giving.

Thus, at best, stands enlightened selfishness, but even this high standard is not often reached.

In ordinary life we find that altruism and egotism do not as yet coalesce as much as we could wish, and in the second place we find that men are not always enlightened enough to perceive the coalition when it does occur, being oftimes short-sighted and inclined to overvalue the bird in the hand. Such as he is, however, the rational man, in whom altruism and egotism tend to coalesce, certainly exists as a type and may very well stand for Self No. 1. He is the man with whom we expect to deal in business, the man to whom self-interest we instinctively address our argument and persuasions. But over and above this man we sometimes find a being—equally self-interested, if you choose to call it so—whose self and whose interests lie outside the limits of Self No. 1.

It is thought by some that space may be actually modified by immaterial forms and perceived by the eye of the mind without the intervention of the eye of sense, and this idea affords us an excellent analogy of the way in which the two selves of a person may

conceivably exist in the same space, and may perceive totally different modifications of the spaces around them. Self No. 1 perceives the material through the medium of the senses, draws an impassable barrier between the ego and the non-ego, and very reasonably values other people and things according to their usefulness or reverse to himself. Self No. 2, the spirit self—within, yet overshadowing all—is bound by the closest tie to the corporeal personality, yet unfettered by its limitations or governed by its laws, and able to identify itself with other spirits or souls, able even to become one with Christ "as I and my Father are one." Able to identify itself and become one with others through love and sympathy that is the distinguishing quality of that other self, the quality which makes it possible to prefer the well-being of others to that of its own primary self, and able to find the highest happiness in a course of action which may involve the sacrifice of all the other self holds most dear. Love, however, does not cover the whole field of unselfish activities, there is duty also. Much might be written on these and their relationship to one another, but at present we can only glance at them as the two forces which sometimes in unison, sometimes in conflict, absorb the entire energies of the higher self between them. This, however, we must bear in mind: the love of the higher self always means an unselfish love, a loyal devotion, although it may be devoted to an unworthy object and mistaken in its promptings. So also the sense of duty which belongs to the higher self must always mean an unselfish devotion to a creed or a cause, however much it may be disfigured by fanaticism. Neither have we time to trace any dividing line between the attendant pleasures of the higher and lower selves, between, for instance, a purely sensuous delight in form and colour and the spiritual insight which sees in them the revelation of some divine idea. It is enough for our present purpose to remember what we already know, namely, that everything which suggests and leads up to the practice of unselfish love and duty is of the higher nature, whilst all which suggests or leads down to the lower self is of the lower self, which, however, is not necessarily an evil self. The enjoyment of physical exercise, of a hearty meal, or a good joke, and what not besides, are all compatible with the higher life, though they may not lead up to it.

This duality is a vague, incomprehensible, contradicting notion, some may say, but our answer is that it is at all events less vague and incomprehensible than the notions which exist in the minds of nine-tenths of us. The whole strength of our position lies in this, that however unsatisfactory our explanations and elaborations may be, the facts on which they are based can be found deep in the heart of nearly every man. The two selves, the two often

rival interests and desires, and the two streams of action therefrom which make up the chequered history of our lives, have to be accepted and somehow accounted for.

II.

We have agreed to consider happiness as the proper object of life, and we have recognised the fact that some people prefer those forms of happiness which appeal to the higher self even though the pursuit of them involves a life-long struggle and sometimes great suffering. Now, the question naturally arises, are they right? Right, that is to say, in supposing that spiritual happiness, or blessedness, does on the whole yield more satisfaction than any other form of happiness? Our impulse is to answer unhesitatingly, Yes; but, for all that, the question is by no means a simple one. First of all, we must concede the fact that thoroughly disinterested people are in a minority—how small that minority is we shall never know; but if we allow mixed motives to count as all pure, mixed interests as all disinterested, we must still admit that those who have chosen the standard of the higher life are fewer than those who make the lower self paramount, and that selfishness rules the world. Now, if there is more happiness to be obtained through unselfishness than through selfishness, or, to speak more precisely, if the quality of the one kind of satisfaction is infinitely more precious and better worth having than the other, how is it that prudence has not discovered the fact? Yet prudence is never unselfish.

Many will say that it is all a matter of temperament, that the same laws do not apply to all, and a close analogy might be traced between the spiritual diathesis and genius. Both may be considered as somewhat abnormal developments, both are subject to fires and frenzies, hopes, fears, and enthusiasms, to which other people are strangers, and both set their hearts on an ideal quite unattainable in this life, for ever yearning and striving after greater perfection instead of being satisfied with having already received greater gifts than their neighbours. But very little is to be gained by following out this train of thought, because, when all is said, the question still remains, Is the possession of genius a blessing or a curse? is the spiritual diathesis one which we should like to have? This is no idle speculation, because although temperaments are born and not made, tendencies (which is all that most of us can boast) can certainly be developed or discouraged both in ourselves and others. The higher faculties, whether intellectual, spiritual, or moral, do not spring suddenly into life, but are of slow growth, and therefore we are bound to look to the future

and to consider not only what we are but what we wish to be; and, in a word, we have to choose between the claims of the higher and the lower self at a time when neither are fully developed however old we may be. On the one hand, we find that conscience exacts many sacrifices and privations without yielding any positive happiness in return, all that we can do is to draw its sting to avoid remorse. Often it seems as if the best part of life were spent in just such sober fashion—the doing of unpleasant tasks and the rejection of pleasant ones in order to avoid the goad of conscience; it is only at times that the veil is lifted and we see "The light that never shone on sea or land," if our material lot happens to be a hard one. On the other hand, enlightened self-interest supplies sufficient discipline for self-respect, and picks out the smoothest tracks and the pleasantest places that come within its reach all through life. There is no rude jostling, no discourtesy, nothing but the will to take all the good that comes without considering the welfare of others, except in relation to self. Does it not seem as if this disposition, so well adapted to the world we live in, is the one best qualified to make us happy?

A large number of people answer this question in the affirmative, but of those who dissent there are, broadly speaking, two divisions which agree in nothing but their adoption of the higher life. The first and largest division is, of course, formed of religious people, Christians chiefly, who necessarily believe that the cultivation of the higher self is for their happiness, both here and hereafter. But the other division consists of a number of thoughtful men and women, agnostics chiefly, who find their happiness here in the cultivation of a higher self, without regard to any possible hereafter. Moreover, they say that conduct which is modified by any consideration of future rewards and punishments is not the highest conduct, is not in any sense disinterested.

To this, however, Christians may safely agree, since it remains for them to point out that ideal Christianity is not simply a life of exemplary conduct, but a development of the higher thought and affections, which involves a corresponding growth of mental and spiritual faculties the enjoyment of which constitutes the higher happiness.

In fact we may say that Christian and Agnostic often worship the same high ideals and cherish the same aspirations with the same disinterested devotion, but with widely different prospects of happiness. In the first place the Christian believes in the absolute living reality of his Ideal, whilst the Agnostic has only abstraction of his own thought and that faint twilight of hope expressed in the saying that "All things are possible where nothing is known."

Again, the Christian regards this world as a prelude to a better,

he believes that his higher self, though not of this world, nor satisfied with it, is becoming more and more fit for a higher state of existence, and being prepared to appreciate far more lovely conditions of being than are at present conceivable. The Agnostic is, of course, unable to console himself with any such visions, and whilst we cannot deny the loftiness of spirit which often animates him, we are sometimes tempted to ask, is his conduct quite rational? Since he knows of nothing beyond the present world, why cling so passionately to those ideals of love, truth and righteousness which are so far out of keeping with existing facts and conditions? Is it because they are hallowed by memories and traditions of childhood, of lessons learnt at a mother's knee, of associations with a faith which the heart cherishes though the mind has renounced it, or is it simply the instinctive yearning for a light which we all seem to feel to some degree?

But whatever the cause may be, and however natural, we must still question whether it is reasonable—that is to say, whether it promotes happiness to cherish the highest ideals and endeavour to live up to them, if they are not joined to religious belief. We recall what Dr. Bain says: that our disinterested impulses "positively detract from our happiness," and although we only accept this statement in a qualified sense, we can scarcely deny that a person not subject to disinterested impulses is more likely to be happy than one who is.

Now so far as we, severally, are concerned we may say perhaps that these conclusions affect us very little, because for good or ill, wisely or unwisely, we do follow certain ideals, are at times visited by disinterested impulses, and would not have it otherwise whatever reason may say; but however readily we may speak for ourselves we must consider very carefully before we answer for others, or attempt to influence their lives.

This aspect of the question seems to have been overlooked, perhaps for the reason that altruistic Agnostics judge other people by themselves. They can conceive of no higher happiness than that of doing good to others, and as such sentiments are beneficial to the Community, they think they should be encouraged. But this is not the conclusion of the whole matter, because, as ethical teachers, they are confronted by a number of young people who are well disposed, but not as a rule philantrophic, and in any case they represent human nature in the making, not highly developed specimens. Now the ethical choice before these young people is not between virtue and vice, because common prudence, the most elementary common sense, is sufficient to convince the intellect that good conduct and self-restraint pay best in the end, and although many succumb to temptation there are few who would attempt to justify them. The practical question, therefore is whether these

young people should be trained to become enlightened egotists, or whether they should have a certain group of Ideals set before them, and be exhorted to strive after them. These ideals, like the highest forms of art, do not usually attract the untrained intelligence very powerfully, not so powerfully as the highly coloured delights that lie nearer to hand, and if left to decide for itself, Youth will usually prefer enlightened egotism to the vague spiritual joys which are comprehended under the head of blessedness. "But," says the high-minded Agnostic, "blessedness counts for more than anything else in my eyes, and I wish you to choose as I have chosen." To this his pupils might answer, might they not? "You are old, we are young; your nature is spiritual, ours is material; and moreover the circumstances of your life, domestic felicity and so forth have perhaps contributed to make you what you are. But with us, and our prospects, all is otherwise, and we think that it is for our happiness to conform as far possible to the world we live in. We perceive the uses of reciprocity and all the qualities summoned up in the expression good citizenship, but when you set before us an Immaculate Standard partially borrowed from Christianity, you invite us to come out of the world which we know, to conquer self by the force of some passionate devotion to an abstract good which only exists in the imagination, and to acquire spiritual tastes and faculties, which can never be fully exercised or enjoyed in a material existence, and cannot be exercised at all, so far as we know when that material existence is at an end."

The subject is a very difficult one, for if, on the other hand, we must admit that the more developed the higher nature is, the better man is able to bear the inevitable sorrow and sufferings of life, we must also admit that he is liable to be more tender and pitiful, and more likely to incur voluntary pains and penalties than others of more selfish constitution. Enlightened egotism teaches us to bear reverses of fortune, or ill health, as cheerfully as possible, since there is nothing to be gained by breaking down, or trying the patience of our friends by querelous complaints, but it also teaches us to avoid the company of sick and sorrowful persons as much as possible. True, it is not pleasant to be considered hard hearted or neglectful, but there are many occasions when it is quite easy to "pass by on the other side" without causing remark (very likely the Levite had some engagement to keep), and 'tis only we who know whether we might not have contrived to sit with the mourner longer than we did, and under such circumstances self-interested people naturally evade depressing effects. But unselfish people as naturally contrive to give more time and help than could be expected from them, voluntarily shutting themselves in darkened rooms, not to receive gratitude and admiration, but to listen to the

complaints or the difficulties of those who are, perhaps, too much engrossed in their own pressing needs even to perceive that any sacrifice has been made for them. Now it is clear that in such cases as these, both the selfish and the unselfish person do what they like best, the one by avoiding what is disagreeable, and the other by avoiding the reproaches of a sensitive conscience, but it is not quite easy to decide which obtains the greater happiness of the two. All through life we see that, although in a general way the dictates of the higher self coincide with those of self-interest, they do not invariably do so. Occasionally in those great questions of life and death, which reveal the heroes and saints of history, and far more frequently in the small questions of personal comfort and pleasure, there is war between the higher and lower self, and inevitable suffering of one kind or the other, therefore the young egotist perhaps has reason on his side when he frankly resents an appeal to his feelings. He is happy enough in his way, immensely interested in himself and his chances, quite willing to disregard proximate pleasures and pains out of regard to future ones, if he sees it is worth his while; but he is not interested in the welfare of other people, or of anything that does not centre round himself, and he does not want to be made uncomfortable by having his higher self touched and civil war declared. If he could realise how long that warfare must last before the higher self obtains dominion he would be still more impatient of altruistic suggestion. At the same time we must not overlook the positive joys of spiritual blessedness; it is a common mistake to paint wordly enjoyments in the brightest colours whilst the beatitudes of the higher self seem to contain little more than the negation of remorse, the absence of strong undisciplined passions and desires, yet the poets tell us otherwise when they speak of the inspirations of nature, and of all things high and noble. Moreover, although it may require a poet to express beatitude, there are few unselfish souls surely who have not had their sacred hours of peace, if not of rapture. But one does not know how to weigh these ethereal joys against the obvious advantages of self-interested action, nor can we show that they invariably compensate for long periods of physical suffering and privation such as the noblest people sometimes voluntarily undergo. Therefore they can only *prefer* this course as being the lesser of two evils, the greater evil being that of neglecting to do the work which, rightly or wrongly, appeals to them as a thing to be done, and the egotist is within his rights if he argues that he does not wish to become inconveniently sensitive to the sufferings of others, or the claims of idealism.

To sum up, the choice of the better part is unquestionably a wise one for some natures, for those who have risen up to a certain

point, but we cannot say with certainty that these high natures are on the whole happier than natures which have never risen beyond enlightened self-interest, nor are they so well adapted to their environment, therefore we have no justification for attempting to mould and influence others, the young especially, to desire the better part unless we believe in a life to come, in which the higher nature will find itself thoroughly at home.

We see clearly enough that if a boy's life is to end when he leaves school there is no occasion to press uncongenial studies upon him; let him learn what he pleases; but if we believe that a career lies before him, we may reasonably point out that certain studies will prove more useful than others, and that certain literary or artistic tastes not yet strong enough to make effort pleasurable, will, if encouraged, become a delight which will long outlast the childish amusements which now rival them.

If this be admitted, it can scarcely be denied that the same judgment applies to life, yet the fact is often overlooked, and whilst we readily admit that religious people have not the monopoly of high ideals and unselfish qualities, we do maintain that religion has the monopoly of reason when she preaches those ideals, and urges them upon characters in the making, because religion alone can dare to give the assurance that it is for the happiness of every one, under all circumstances, to choose the better part.

Hitherto we have been studying happiness from an ethical standpoint, but we cannot conclude without glancing at its practical aspects, and the familiar question at once arises, "Is life worth living?" The moral value of life, of course, depends upon our convictions, religious or otherwise, but this forms no part of our present inquiry. We wish to know whether life is worth living for its own sake—whether it shows a balance of pleasure over pain, or the reverse, quite apart from its uses.

At first sight the mere fact that people almost always cling to life and shrink from death, the universal prevalence of the will to live, throughout all animate nature, seems a sufficient answer to the question, but we have to remember that there are numbers of people who delude themselves with false hopes.

"Man never is, but always to be blessed," said Pope; and there are few who do not, in youth at all events, expect greater prizes than they ever obtain. Thus it might be said, that as gamblers return again and again to the tables, buoyed up by hopes which the moralist knows are delusive, so man awakes day after day with the belief that his luck must turn at last, or that he is somehow going to feel happier than heretofore. Therefore, the mere fact that men cling to life does not prove that they have any good reason for doing so, though it does afford presumptive evidence to that effect, since

we can scarcely imagine there could be such a universal love of life unless it were founded upon a general experience of joy in living; but further than this we cannot go.

The question which seems to excite popular interest more than any other is one as to the distribution of happiness.

Is it evenly dealt, does it depend on circumstance, or is it a state of the mind? Almost every one has decided opinions on these matters.

The unreflective, of course, hold the belief that happiness depends on outward circumstances, and is, therefore, unevenly distributed. Some people, they say, have everything—money, high birth, good looks, and good health—whilst others have next to nothing; and others, again, have some advantages and some disadvantages, and all is as plain as can be! But the more thoughtful perceive that if this were true the upper classes ought to be, with few exceptions, radiantly happy, whilst the poor and needy ought to be overwhelmed with gloom and misery; but they are not. On the contrary, genuine merriment may be found in slums, light hearts under shabby waistcoats, and some very sad, gloomy, and discontented faces may be seen in fashionable and exclusive circles where people seem to possess all that the world has to give. Consequently the thoughtful observer is apt to jump to the conclusion that happiness is a state of mind, and not an adjunct of circumstances. Let us admit the truth of this, but when we have added that, after all, states of mind are largely dependent upon outward circumstances, we shall seem to be moving in a circle, and if we further decide that states of mind are procured by the inter-action of character and circumstances, and circumstances on character, we shall see at a glance that happiness cannot safely be predicted in any given case. Sometimes, when we think over the lives of our friends, so far as we are able to judge them, we are inclined to think that happiness has been pretty evenly shared between them. One man is more successful than another—but then he has ill-health, or a peevish wife, or an anxious, worrying disposition; so that, in one way or another, from within or from without, comes the corrective good or bad, to make things even, like the book-keeper's balance, which appears now on this side of the page, now on that, according to where it is needed to make up the required amount.

But although most people will agree, on reflection, that this is the case in general, almost all will be able to quote cases personally known to them where the average of happiness, or of unhappiness, has been greatly exceeded. There is some one member of a family whom we unhesitatingly pick out as most unfortunate, both in circumstances or character, whilst there are others who are just the reverse; and if we look further afield, at the strangers we meet in the street

and at public assemblies, we shall certainly see some circumstances heavily marked and marred by suffering, and some not only radiantly happy at the moment, but without the traces of past suffering. Nor does age in any way account for these exceptions, for the miserable face may be a youthful one, and the happy face may be worn with silver hair; they are exceptions which admit of no generalisation whatever, so far as we can see.

There is a tendency in the present day to preach a doctrine of absolute justice, based on a supposed ratio between conduct and circumstances; thus, a fit of temper, say, indicates a fit of neuralgia, or sneezing, perhaps, in mild cases, whilst giving means receiving, and so forth. The notion lends itself to ridicule, but, stripped of manifest absurdities (that is, of its modern dress), it commends itself to many practical people, because they perceive that in a general way good conduct and prosperity, bad conduct and adversity, do run together. Moreover they see that, although undeserved misfortunes do occur, they may be turned to good account, or be compensated for through the sympathy they arouse, and *vice versa*. But these principles only hold good up to a certain point, and if we recall our conclusions as to the choice of the better part, we shall see at a glance why this is so. We saw, then, that reason teaches self-love to lead a reputable industrious life, because it pays better than an idle, dissolute one, thereby exemplifying the doctrine that good conduct and prosperity go together. But we also perceived that unselfish love and devotion, the instinct of the higher self, sometimes exacts the sacrifice of self-interest, and although it obtains the higher happiness, it does not often meet with any reward which would appeal to selfishness.

Hence we must conclude that whilst it is worth while, from a selfish point of view, to be good and virtuous, it is not worth while, from a selfish point of view, to be "unco' gude."

Lastly, we must ask how far is it possible to increase our happiness by our own efforts? Let it be taken for granted that we are doing our best ethically both for our souls and bodies. Is there anything more we can do by any effort of will to lighten our burdens and meliorate our condition?

Emerson seems to answer us at once when he says, get health! "No labour, pains, poverty, nor exercise that can gain it must be begrudged." And again he says: "It is observed that a depression of spirits develops the germs of plague in individuals and persons."

We forget how much health of body means health of mind, and that means not only the power to cope with difficulties, but increased capacity for enjoyment. Health finds pleasure in the mere fact of living and moving, of breathing fresh air, and looking

n the face of nature, whilst it minimises the worries and dis-omforts of life. Health laughs where weakness weeps, and delights n a heritage of work and endeavour. Yes, by all means let us get ealth if we can, and if we add to this a settled conviction that here is nothing so bad but what it is well to make the best of it, ve shall have gathered as much practical benefit as the study of happiness is likely to afford.

A. M. F.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.

The evolution doctrine, for it has passed the merely theoretical stage, is asserting its influence in all departments of thought and knowledge, and now Professor James Mark Baldwin thinks the time has come to apply it to thought and knowledge themselves. The result is the production of the important work, the first volume of which is now before us with the sub-title of *Functional Logic*, or *Genetic Theory of Knowledge*.[1] Two more volumes are to follow, the second will deal with the "Genetic Theory of Thought," and the subject of the third volume will be "Real Logic." The volumes will appear almost simultaneously in a French edition, the work having been undertaken for the *Bibliothèque de Psychologie Expérimentale*, under the direction of M. Toulouse. Professor Baldwin's reputation as a psychologist is in itself a guarantee of the thoroughness of the work, and the fact that a new work from the pen of an American professor is being published simultaneously in England and France is evidence of the importance which is attached to it. It is scarcely a book for the general reader, but it will secure the attention of experts and students for whom it is written. The style is inevitably technical and so condensed that careful study is necessary to do the author justice. Though not exactly a pioneer in the field of genetic logic, Professor Baldwin may fairly claim to be so far original as to be the first to attempt a consistent application of a consciously genetic method "throughout the entire stretch of cognition from the simplest to the most developed modes." This is the application to psychology of the method which has been so fruitful in results in every branch of physical science. It is the discovery of the continuity of thought as well as of things, the unbroken progress from the germ to the highest development, the progress of different functions longitudinally, as Professor Baldwin expresses it, and the absence of transverse sections. Applied to psychology the method is illuminating and full of promise. We cordially commend this important work to all students of psychology and look forward to its completion with more than usual interest.

[1] *Thought and Things*. A Study of the Development and Meaning of Thought, or Genetic Logic. By James Mark Baldwin, Ph.D., &c. Vol. I. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1906.

Mr. Howard Hinton, who has favoured us with a striking book on *The Fourth Dimension*,[1] is something more than an ingenious geometrician, he is an idealist and might be a poet. It is probably for this reason we find him difficult to follow. Fourth dimensional space, of which he treats with so much facility, is a purely arbitrary conception and arbitrary conceptions are personal affairs. What may appear almost self-evident to one man may be unintelligible to another who can neither affirm nor deny the truth of it. We can agree with Mr. Hinton that there are modes of existence to which our conception of space of three dimensions does not apply, it does not indeed apply to our own world of thought and feeling, to our higher world, as Mr. Hinton terms it; but neither in our opinion does his conception of a space of four dimensions. Rather, we think, of the "higher world" as not affected by space conditions, though it appears to exist within space as we know it. But Mr. Hinton is an ingenious geometrician and has spared no pains to make the probable existence of a fourth dimension clear to his readers. We confess that we have patiently studied Mr. Hinton's numerous diagrams, and followed his reasoning without being convinced. He has opened up more than one interesting field of speculation and provided mental exercises which will tax the ingenuity of his readers, but the fourth dimension still eludes us. Mr. Hinton borrows suggestions from Plato and Aristotle, Pythagoras and Parmenides, and avails himself of the labours of the famous geometricians, Lobatchewsky, Bolyai and Gauss, of whom he gives brief accounts, so that apart from the special theory of the book it is not without interest. Such pursuits are at least interesting recreations and contribute to the mental development of those who engage in them, if kept within proper bounds.

Genesis and Exodus as History[2] we may say at once is a very good book, without showing much sign of originality. It is in full sympathy with the higher criticism, but deals with its subject in a simple and popular manner; to appreciate its arguments a knowledge of Hebrew is not necessary; any careful and intelligent reader of the English version of the Old Testament can understand them and assure himself of their validity. Genesis and Exodus are subjected to a careful analysis with the result that their unhistorical character is placed beyond doubt. The late Mr. James Thomas had read widely and is as much at home in geological criticism as in Egyptian history, though he makes less use than he might have done of Harnack's *Babel and Bible*. The work is not written for specialists but for the ordinary reader who is

[1] *The Fourth Dimension.* By C. Howard Hinton, M.A. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1906.

[2] *Genesis and Exodus as History.* A Critical Inquiry. By the late James Thomas. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1906.

interested in Bible studies. The tone of the work is particularly good and as far as we have seen the writer has carefully avoided the use of any expression calculated to offend a Christian. For the most part Genesis and Exodus are left to demonstrate their own lack of historical authority, but a chapter on the compilation of the Pentateuch sets forth the general evidence for its being in the main the work of Jews after the Babylonian captivity.

SOCIOLOGY, POLITICS, AND JURISPRUDENCE.

The Royal Courts of Justice possessed no figure more familiar than that of the late Mr. Witt, K.C., and his sudden and premature death in the Strand on his way to Chambers came as a shock to the whole profession. In his *Life in the Law*,[1] the learned counsel has left us some memorials of his life, some pictures of the law as it was administered in his earlier days, some good legal stories, and a number of criticisms upon modern practice and legal education, which will meet with approval or condemnation according to the predilections of each particular reader. For instance, Mr. Witt was convinced that the Bar examinations were not only useless but pernicious. "Cramming," he writes, "is substituted for a well-ordered course of reading and lectures, which are in themselves important aids to legal education, are apt to be attended rather with a view to the examination than to sound learning." The old system of "apprenticeship" is, Mr. Witt contends, the best. There is a great deal of truth in this, and Mr. Witt was not merely a clever advocate, but a sound lawyer and a distinguished scholar. At the same time Mr. Witt recognised that a three years' apprenticeship, with its heavy fees, would shut out many men from the profession. For legislation Mr. Witt had a supreme contempt. The only statutes of any utility, in his view, are those which repeal other statutes. The Judicature Acts were a colossal blunder—"a judicial revolution which only one man wanted, and which nearly every one now deplores." From this brief notice it will be seen that the learned author has given both the profession and the public not entertainment but much food for serious thought.

The Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute, Vol. XXXVII., 1905–1906,[2] edited by the Secretary, show no falling off in interest.

[1] *Life in the Law.* By John George Witt, K.C., Bencher of Lincoln's Inn, formerly Senior Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. Illustrated. London: T. Werner Laurie.

[2] *Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute, Vol. XXXVII.*, 1905–1906. Edited by the Secretary. London: The Institute. 1906.

Papers were read on The Anglo-Australian Position, by Mr. W. J. Snowden; Sierra Leone, by Mr. T. J. Alldridge; The Future of Western Canada, by Mr. E. B. Osborn; The East Africa Protectorate, by Sir Charles Eliot; The Products of Australia, by the Hon. J. G. Jenkins; Our Emigration Plans, by General Booth; The New Agricultural Movement, by Mr. P. J. Hannon; Our Policy in the West Indies, by Miss C. de Thierry; Australian Immigration, by Mr. Walter James, K.C.; India under British Rule, by Mr. Arthur Sawtell; The Development of our British African Empire, by Mr. Lionel Decle; and The Oilfields of Trinidad, by Mr. E. H. Cunningham Craig. We fully agree with Lord Brassey's opening remarks, in which he claimed that the meetings of the Institute were helpful in diffusing throughout the old country a more intimate knowledge of the daughter States, of which we are all proud, and of forming a link of our world-wide Empire. Moreover, the discussions which follow the papers are extremely valuable, inasmuch as the conservative members of the Institute—and they appear to be in a majority—receive the candid criticism of progressive colonials, to which, from progressive Englishmen, they would probably pay little or no attention. There is no better school for forming sound views and eradicating bias than the open debate where all meet on level ground. There can be no question that for this cause alone the Institute more than justifies its existence.

There is still plenty of room for books such as *Emancipation: A Message of the Twentieth Century*,[1] by Mr. Frederick Rathe Eames. It is an epitome of the history and development of the human intellect. Religious bodies still pay a prominent part in our civilisation, and are still, and will, as long as they exist, endeavour to dominate the minds of men. Dr. Newman once said, "Let us maintain before we have proved. This seeming paradox is the secret of happiness." Such has ever been the attitude of the cleric. Long and bitter has been the struggle for the truth, and a heavy penalty has been paid through many weary centuries since the first witch-doctor established his hold by playing upon the superstitions of pre-historic man for the priestly domination under which the world has groaned. And even now, after tens of thousands of years, as Mr. Eames truly says, "clerical domination would be re-established, were it not for the ever-active opposition of men who will think for themselves." In the Education Bill of a Liberal Government we have the strongest evidence of the strength of the sectaries who, in their endeavour to retain their control of the human mind at its most impressionable stage, are sacrificing the mental vitality of a nation. And whilst the cry for truth and reality and the brushing away of the terrors and miseries insepa-

[1] *Emancipation: A Message of the Twentieth Century.* By Frederick Rathe Eames. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., Ltd. 1906.

rable from ignorance arises in every civilised nation of the earth, ministers of religion of every denomination continue to hug their theories founded on misconception and superstition, and to carry on the *rôle* of the "blind leading the blind." This is a book to be placed in the hands of every individual who has any desire to think for himself and to escape from the trammels of convention, superstition, and ignorance.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

In *From St. Francis to Dante*,[1] Mr. G. G. Coulton offers the public a translation, with notes and illustrations from other mediæval sources, of all that he considers to be of primary interest in the chronicle of the Franciscan Saltimbene (1221–1288), which is now being edited by Professor Holder-Egger in *Monumenta Germaniæ*. This remarkable document, written solely for the edification of a cloistered niece, after many vicissitudes and numerous mutilations by scandalised readers in the Counter-Reformation period, was acquired for the Vatican Library by Leo XIII. Its author has been the subject of learned monographs by Professors Clédat and Michael, and Mr. Kingston Oliphant has printed a very brief abstract of the Chronicle itself. Saltimbene's birth synchronised with St. Dominic's death. Deeply impressed by the North Italian religious revival known as the "Great Alleluia" (1233), he secretly joined, at the of sixteen, the novices of the Friars Minor at his native town, Parma, and in due course became a priest and preacher, studying hard, writing much, and, for many years, wandering from one province of his Order to another in France, Burgundy, Provence, and Italy, impelled thereto partly by the distracted condition of the times, partly, perhaps, by love of travel. Had his ambition been on a par with his curiosity, for which posterity should be grateful, he might easily have attained high preferment. As with Pepys and Boswell, his very failings as a man—he could appreciate good cheer, washed down by a generous vintage, on the rare occasions when they came in his way—are to his advantage as an historian. This worthy friar's devotion to his Order cannot be gainsaid, although he seems not to have attempted to attain the ascetic ideal of its founder. Like all mediæval writers, he dwells on the corruptions rather than the virtues of the age in which he lived; but, unlike them, he describes the world outside the cloister, on which he looked out with sympathetic eyes, in a picturesque style, in striking contrast to the

[1] *From St. Francis to Dante.* By G. G. Coulton, M.A. London: David Nutt.

exasperatingly jejune records of the average chronicler. In the minds of many, the thirteenth century seems to swim in a haze of Fra Angelico blue; nevertheless, scepticism was rampant in certain sections of society; in the universities under Frederick II., well described in Renau's *Averroës*, among the self-indulgent rich, conspicuous in *Piers Plowman* and in Sacchetti's *Sermons*, and the failure of the Crusades, provoked an explosion of popular infidelity throughout Europe. Again, the duties to temporal and spiritual powers were often in hopeless conflict. Saltimbene was a Franciscan of the second generation, and the fact that he overlapped St. Francis by five years and Dante by five-and-twenty justifies to some extent the title which Mr. Coulton has chosen for this work, which bristles with controversial matter. It is to be regretted that Mr. Coulton has thought fit to devote more than one chapter to a polemic against the Catholic Church.

THE DRAMA.

FOUR plays, the text of which has been collated with the first and second quartos by Mr. William Archer, viz., *The Constant Couple*, *The Twin Rivals*, *The Recruiting Officer*, and *The Beaux' Strategem*, are comprised in the latest volume of the Mermaid edition of *George Farquhar*.[1] In the case of the first named, the original form of Act V., Sec. 1 is reprinted from the first quarto in the Bodleian Library, and appears in an appendix. Farquhar was an alumnus of Trinity College, Dublin, who, after an unsuccessful career as an actor, betook himself to playwriting. His first play, which is wholly destitute of literary value, procured him a lieutenancy in a marching regiment. He died in poverty in his thirtieth year. Mr. Archer's critical introduction is of admirable scholarship.

Mr. John Summers was ill-advised in choosing for his drama in five acts so well-worn a theme as *Oliver Cromwell*.[2] We have searched in vain for any "purple patches" which might break the appalling monotony of his blank verse, of which the following passage may be taken as a fair specimen:

> "His henchmen even offered him the crown,
> But he much better knew than to accept it,
> Though he had spoken of a crowning mercy."

---

[1] *George Farquhar*. Mermaid Series. Edited by William Archer. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

[2] *Oliver Cromwell*. An Historical Drama in Five Acts. By John Summers. London: The International Copyright Bureau.

There are eighty-eight pages, averaging fifty lines to each page, of this sort of stuff.

BELLES LETTRES.

The Secret Church[1] by Lucas Cleeve, has already deservedly reached a second edition. This is an exceptionally pleasant story to read, there is enough sensation and adventure in it to keep the attention of the reader intensely interested, without descending to the level of what is generally called a sensational novel. The secret church itself is an original idea, for a band of Anarchists have taken possession of a deserted monastery in the disguise of monks and are accepted as such in the neighbourhood. Externally they are to all appearance what they pretend to be, while behind the scenes they are revealed as conspirators with dark designs. Their chief design is to get a young count into their power in order to secure his fortune to carry out their revolutionary purposes, in which they very nearly succeed by working upon his pious susceptibilities and taking advantages of difficulties which threaten to prevent his marriage with Donna Bianca. The love affairs of the young couple are charmingly related, and in the end it is the Marchese herself who defeats the conspirators and rescues her lover from imminent death. The other principal characters in the story, the girl's father, the young count's mother, the pretended priests, the terrible *Presidente* of the *Secret Church* are all drawn with vigour and sympathy and secure the reader's interest. The story is truly dramatic and might do well for the stage.

Molly O'Neill, the heroine of *A Maid and her Money*,[2] was, if heredity counts for anything, bound to be a remarkable young woman, for her father was a professor of Celtic, and of her uncles one was a scholarly canon of Westminster Cathedral, and the other "the champion pork-packer of Chicago." In addition to beauty of the Watteau shepherdess order, she possessed brains, a finely drawn nervous system, and emotions inclined to the primitive. Her unexpected succession to the Chicago millions, whilst enabling her to carry out certain far-reaching philanthropic plans, seriously threatened to wreck her happiness, for her undeclared suitor was one of those individuals more commonly met with in fiction than in real life, who entertain scruples about marrying heiresses. Mr. J. S. Fletcher has handled his subject very cleverly and produced a story of intense human interest.

[1] *The Secret Church.* By Lucas Cleeve. London: Digby, Long & Co. 1906.
[2] *A Maid and her Money.* By J. S. Fletcher. London: Digby, Long & Co.

Mr. T. W. Speight's name has long been before an appreciative public. He is best known as a cunning weaver of sensational stories, of which his twenty-ninth and latest, *Under a Cloud*,[1] is by no means the least interesting. From the first chapter one felt instinctively that its bright young hero was not doomed to be a victim of circumstantial evidence. Nevertheless, the vindication of his innocence seemed impossible without too gross a violation of probability. By an ingeniously unhackneyed device, Mr. Speight, however, overcomes a difficulty which to the less experienced novelist would have proved insuperable.

That a solicitor in full practice and enjoying an assured position in county society should jilt the beautiful girl to whom he had lately become engaged for a bold gipsy with whom chance had brought him a few times into contact is a fact which can only find its explanation in witchcraft. And this is the simple plot of *The Red Van*,[2] a charming story by Mr. Alan St. Aubyn. So subtle is the air of *vraisemblance* thrown by the author's art that the anachronism of this solution passes unchallenged.

In *A Desperate Game*,[3] Mr. John K. Leys presents us with no less than three villains—to wit, a blackmailer, who is happily killed off in the second chapter; a plausible solicitor, who kidnaps one of the heroines for a wicked baronet, and, as she possesses both good looks and a considerable fortune, almost succeeds, by a heartless lie, in marrying her himself. Sir Rufus Deveril is a nobleman who would do credit to transpontine melodrama, in which his approach would be announced by slow music. There is some pretty love-making between Captain Fitzgerald and the blackmailer's daughter. Taken altogether, it is scarcely a convincing story to the sophisticated reader.

A singularly pathetic interest attaches to *The Dream and the Business*,[4] as being the last, and, perhaps, the most precious legacy bequeathed to posterity by the most brilliant woman who has adorned literature since the death of George Eliot, between whose genius and that of Mrs. Craigie it would not be impossible to find several analogies. Widely sundered as was their respective outlooks on life, yet, curiously enough, both were, at one period of their careers, attracted by the Spanish mystic, St. Theresa. Although lacking the spontaneity that characterised *Robert Orange*, *The Dream and the Business* presents many features which raise it to a higher plane of fiction than its famous predecessor. Nonconformity, as contrasted with Agnosticism and Catholicism, here appears, in types varying from cultured old- and new-fashioned orthodoxy, through dubitative

1 *Under a Cloud.* By T. W. Speight. London: Digby, Long & Co.
2 *The Red Van.* By Alan St. Aubyn. London: Digby, Long & Co.
3 *A Desperate Game.* By John K. Leys. London: Digby, Long & Co.
4 *The Dream and the Business.* By John Oliver Hobbes. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

assent, down to worldly Philistinism. The problem, or rather series of problems, is further complicated by the study of the eternal marriage question and "Platonic" friendships. Tessa, Lady Marlesford, is to her husband, who is devoted to her, *une femme incomprise.* Women of her exotic type are to be met with in Ouida's novels and Ibsen's plays, and, assuredly, without the ardent faith in Catholicism possessed by her, but denied to them, her fate must have resembled theirs. Mrs. Craigie's analysis of society is at once subtle and sympathetic. The moral teaching suggested by her last masterpiece would seem to be that perfect happiness is unattainable on earth, and that one must be contented with a compromise that scarcely satisfies the cravings of a spiritual nature.

THE

WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

VOL. CLXVI. No. 5.—NOVEMBER 1906.

THE MONTH.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

The Milner Memorial.

LORD MILNER has recently received from his admirers in this country and in South Africa memorials of a highly laudatory character; and special interest attaches to the South African memorial which, signed by upwards of 25,000 inhabitants of Cape Colony, was presented to Lord Milner at the offices of the Imperial South African Association on September 28. The address "refers to Lord Milner's services in South Africa; states that he did all that was possible, consistently with a jealous regard for England's honour, and a steadfast determination to safeguard the British connection, to avert war; and alludes to his devotion and indefatigable industry."[1] And Sir Lewis Michell (ex-Minister for Agriculture, Cape Colony) in making the presentation, spoke in the usual vein of "the splendid courage with which" Lord Milner "upheld the honour of the Empire at a critical moment, when a smaller man would have proceeded on lines of less resistance"; and testified that, seeing Lord Milner almost daily at that time, he "never saw him otherwise than calm and collected and inflexibly resolute, at whatever risk, to see that by no act or word of his was our flag trailed in the dust." There were, of course, also, the usual attacks on "Little Englanders," and the usual confident appeals to the verdict of the impartial historian of the future. "Little Englanders," said Sir Lewis, "may sit in a Court of First Instance, but they have no place at the Bar of History, that Ultimate Tribunal of Appeal at which all great men are judged"; and concluding, "in 'Ercles' vein," he declared, the

[1] *Daily News*, September 29.

overwhelming array of facts to the contrary notwithstanding, "We know that the vast majority of our fellow-countrymen at home and abroad thank you, sir, from the very ground of their hearts for having helped by character, by capacity, by courage, and strenuous effort to build up throughout the world the imperishable name of England." "A photo of the members of the Cape Committee" accompanied the memorial, and we can only trust that it may be carefully preserved so that the historian of the future may have the melancholy pleasure of studying the physiognomy of the type of man responsible for the preparation of this astounding, this fulsome and lying address.

A Pyramid of Skulls.

"Devotion" Lord Milner did show—to the Randlords! and "indefatigable industry"—in their interests! While his "jealous regard for England's honour" was evidenced by his "new diplomacy" during the negotiations that led to the war, by his attitude in regard to the "Concentration Camps," and by his support of Chinese slavery! His "steadfast determination to safeguard the British connection," would, if the people of this country had allowed it to be persisted in, have resulted in Lord Milner losing South Africa to the Empire, as the equally "steadfast determination" of another German—King George III., to wit—resulted in the loss to our Empire of the North American Colonies, now the United States of America. To say that Lord Milner showed "a steadfast determination . . . to avert war" is, in plain terms, a lie. Mr. Chamberlain himself admitted that Mr. Kruger had granted even more than Lord Milner (then Sir Alfred Milner) had ventured to ask, that the Boers had conceded nine-tenths of our demands and that the remaining tenth was not worth fighting for. Yet we went to war! "At a critical moment"—when, as the *Times* practically stated in so many words, "there was a danger of peace"; "at a critical moment, when a smaller man would have proceeded on lines of less resistance"—and peace would have resulted, Lord Milner, with "splendid courage . . . upheld the honour of the Empire"—by making war, war for the gold-grabbers, "murder for gold," inevitable!! No matter how finely engrossed on vellum, no matter how beautifully illuminated, no matter how profusely bedight with gold, this "South African Memorial to Lord Milner," Lord Milner's friend and admirer, the very man who presented the memorial, has himself unwittingly exposed it as a mockery and a fraud. To the historian of the future this memorial will be of less weight and worth than the parchment upon which it is written; and before his spiritual vision there will loom up, rising ghost-like from the blood-soaked veldt, the true South African Memorial to Lord Milner—a pyramid of skulls. The broad base of the pyramid formed of

the skulls of the 22,000 British officers and men—(well-nigh a skull for each signature to the South African address!); next, in a broad band, the skulls of 5000 brave Burghers; then, tier after tier, the skulls of the 20,000 Boer women and children, whom, if not done to death, Lord Milner at least did "not strive officiously to keep alive" in the "Cemetery Camps," and finally, surmounting the whole, the colossal statue, in blood-stained gold, of a yellow slave! Such is the memorial that Lord Milner, with "strenuous effort," with "indefatigable industry," has, building perchance worse than he knew, set up for himself in South Africa!

Milner "Un-English."

But Lord Milner, apparently, is utterly lacking in spiritual discernment. Otherwise he could not but realise, to some extent at least, the horror of what he has done. Otherwise he could not but hide his head in shame, and thrust from him with trembling yet determined hands the blind and blatant Jingoes and the conscienceless self-seekers who wish to do him "honour." And, in that case, he might well be left in peace. But, so far from being ashamed and repentant, Lord Milner still upholds and glories in his South African policy, "believing it to be in the best interests of South Africa and in accordance with the intentions of the Government and the country"—(this in spite of the results of the General Election!)—"which sent him out." He ventures to speak of "these dreary days of reaction"—(But for the reaction against his insensate policy we should inevitably have lost South Africa!)—"when much for which they had fought had been thrown away, and much more"—(Chinese labour and the ascendency of the Randlords, we suppose)—"was threatened." And he dared to claim as one of "the great objects which they all had in view," "the gradual fusion of the white races in South Africa into one nation!" Why that fusion was rapidly taking place till the process was rudely interrupted by Lord Milner's war, and if the two white races are again in course of fusion in spite of that war, it is only because they are united in a common detestation of and a common determination to get rid of the Milner policy in South Africa! Briton will make common cause with Boer against Lord Milner's friends, the Randlords, and against Lord Milner's *protégés*, the Chinese slaves. And who and what is Lord Milner that he should presume to dub as "Little Englanders" the Liberal party, which represents the sympathies and aspirations of this country and the Empire at large as the late Tory Government never did; that he should presume to lecture the country upon "the danger at home" of "the growth of a spirit of what he could only call anti-nationalism"; that he should dare to say that "South Africa had suffered, and was still suffering in a quite special degree from the anti-national, the anti-British party at home"? Who

and what is Lord Milner—pro-Randlord and "pro-Chow"—that he should sneer at "pro-Zuluism"? Lord Milner, no doubt, would enslave the Zulus at the behest of the Randlords, as he sought to enslave the Kaffirs and did enslave the Chinese coolies. But such a policy, nevertheless, is absolutely "un-English" and immoral, and could only end in disaster; and it is those who support, not those who oppose this policy, who are in truth "the most dangerous of all enemies, the forces of dissolution working from within." Lord Milner, who poses as an authority upon what is British and what "un-British," Lord Milner who lectures the Liberal party on "Little Englandism" and "anti-nationalism," is himself "un-English!" He is not English-born. It would indeed be interesting to know whether he is even a naturalised Englishman; whether, in point of fact, his patent of "nobility" is really valid.

"Tax Monopoly and Relieve Industry."

That much for which Lord Milner and his friends fought—or, rather, "engineered" the war—is threatened is very true. It becomes increasingly evident, not only that the Randlord party, unable to rid themselves of their Jonah, John Chinaman, will be overwhelmingly defeated at the forthcoming Transvaal elections, but that a just nemesis will speedily overtake them. On Wednesday August 22, the inaugural meeting of the Reform Club was held in Johannesburg, and Mr. Wybergh, the President, delivered an address on the "Necessity for Reform." In its declaration of principles the Reform Club affirms:

"(*A*) That the natural wealth of the Transvaal is sufficiently great to maintain a large and properous white population, and that the depression from which the Colony has been and is suffering arises from definite causes susceptible for the most part of remedy by legislative action.

"(*B*) That these causes are in the main:

"(1) The maintenance of an industrial system economically and socially unsound and the insufficient participation of the people as a whole in the natural wealth of the country.

"(2) Inequitable taxation—the effect of which is to penalise industry, hamper trade, and maintain an unnecessarily high cost of living.

"(3) The absence of legislation calculated to afford sufficient protection to investors and shareholders from dishonest financial methods and the consequent check upon the investment of European capital.

"(4) The artificial encouragement of racial division."

And Mr. Wybergh, dealing with the application of these principles, declared that "the burdens on the people and on industry should be removed, and that the remission should be made good by calling upon those who own the mineral wealth of the

country to contribute a larger share to the advancement of its prosperity." "'Tax monopoly and relieve industry' may be said to have been his text," says the able correspondent of the *Daily News* in his account of the meeting.[1]

Rand Dividends.

It is very clear, from this meeting, from the subsequent formation of the Transvaal National Association and of other associations on similar lines to the Reform Club, and from the recent re-affirmation by the Johannesburg City Council of their demand for the rating of land values, that a day of reckoning for the Rand magnates is at hand, and that the advice given some years ago by the *South African Guardian*—advice which we have reiterated time and again—"Let the State tax the mines on their value, less capital expenditure, whether working or idle," will probably be acted upon ere long. And in this connection Mr. Wyburgh quoted some very instructive official figures. "He showed that in 1904–5 thirty-three companies paid dividends to the amount of about £4,000,000 on an issued capital of £16,000,000, representing an interest rate of 24 per cent.," and that "out of this £16,000,000 of issued capital there was £3,300,000 working capital, and the rest was paper—promoters' shares and vendors' shares. As the working capital was issued at a premium in many cases, it was increased by six millions sterling, with the result that, to quote Mr. Wyburgh, the total amount which had to be put into the ground to produce the income of £4,000,000 per annum was £9,000,000. That returned a still more opulent rate of interest—42 per cent. So that it was open to any person when those mines were floated—to any person who owned a mine—to put in £9 and make £4 a year." And it was to make this possible that the war was "engineered"! It was to make this possible that Chinese slavery was introduced! "Mr. Wyburgh," continues the report, "proceeded to show that the savings in the cost of production by the reduction in the cost of dynamite since the war amounts to £950,000 per annum, and the saving due to the reduction in the cost of coal to £450,000 per annum. Needless to say that he convinced his audience that the railway taxation of £600,000 should be remitted, and direct taxation on the mines be increased."

Progressive Rout Predicted.

It is significant that the only reply of the pro-Randlord and pro-slavery Press to this speech was an attempt to stir up racial prejudice. It is still more significant that when two days later, at a meeting held at Fordsburg and attended by 2,000 British miners, Sir George Farrer, President of the so-called "Progressive Association," "tried to raise the racial issue by attacking the Dutch

[1] *Daily News*, September 19.

leaders . . . someone immediately called for three cheers for *Het Volk*, and there was a response that taught the British supremacy party a lesson." The meeting, from the Randlord point of view, proved a fiasco, for finally, "the Progressive representatives having . . . had all the British sentiment pumped into them that they could stand, took their departure amid a storm of groans," and on the motion of Mr. R. L. Outhwaite a resolution was carried, amid scenes of the greatest enthusiasm, by 2000 votes to 2 "That in the best interests of the Transvaal the Progressive candidates should be defeated at the polls, and that the Chinese should be repatriated at the expiry of present contracts." "This meeting," says the *Daily News* correspondent in conclusion, "reveals in a flash what has long been concealed (by the pro-Randlord Press). The British worker on the Rand is an opponent of Chinese labour, and when the elections come he is going to deal with the Progressive party as his comrades at home dealt with the Conservatives." So mote it be. And when the time comes we trust that they will bear in mind the figures quoted by Mr. Wyburgh and the advice given by the *South African Guardian* and "tax the mines on their value, less capital expenditure, whether working or idle." Then, indeed, will all the Randlords realise (as the magnates of the Randfontein group of mines have already realised) that Chinese slavery "does not pay." "If the tax were made heavy enough," not only would any attempt on the part of the Randlords to carry out their threat to "close down the mines" recoil on their own heads, but as the *Guardian* puts it, "there would be such a rush for labour, such a zeal to produce that the Tranvaal would hum with prosperity."

Repatriate Lord Selborne!

If the continuation of the Milner *regimé* be permitted it means the ruin of South Africa, the loss of South Africa to the Empire. Lord Selborne stands self-confessed as an upholder of the Milner *regimé*. Therefore we once more reiterate our demand, "repatriate Lord Selborne." Reuter informs us that at Bulawayo on October 5 last, "replying to addresses, the High Commissioner referred to the resolution which he had made on his arrival in South Africa, to be guided by the imagination of the late Mr. Cecil Rhodes, for in the evolution of South Africa two qualities, work and imagination, were required. He paid a tribute to the genius of Mr. Cecil Rhodes." It is not the only tribute paid to the genius of Mr. Cecil Rhodes, to the genius of Milnerism. South Africa, and the British Empire as a whole have paid only too many tributes to the genius of the great Empire-wrecker—a tribute in gold of upwards of two hundred and fifty millions sterling! tribute in tears and in blood! tribute in loss of prestige and in loss of honour! tribute in shame unspeakable! "Enough of such tributes!" say we. "Enough; and more than

enough!" And, therefore, we conclude as we began, "Repatriate Lord Selborne!"

A Nation in Arms.

We cannot but regard as most mischievous, in effect if not in intent, the series of speeches recently delivered by Mr. Haldane with a view to "popularising the conception of a nation in arms."[1] Protest as he may, to popularise such a conception is to popularise the spirit of militarism; and his "broadening of the basis of the Army"[2] is nothing but veiled conscription, just as Mr. Chamberlain's "broadening of the basis of taxation" was merely veiled Protection. In one breath the Secretary for War, who would seem to be a Secretary at War with many basic Liberal principles, approves the action of Mr. Balfour in "laying down the principle that the command of the sea is the real security of our Empire," and in the next he calls for "a nation in arms!" The truth of the matter is, obviously enough, that if we have command of the sea the Empire is secure, and we have, for defensive purposes (and these alone will we consider), no need whatever for "a nation in arms"; while, if we lose command of the sea, we lose at the same time our food supply, and not even "a nation in arms" could prevent our being starved into surrender. We agree with Mr. Haldane that "some future generation may, nay, will, look back upon us, as we did on the Picts and Scots, as foolish people"—criminally foolish people—"for spending on armaments what had better have been spent on the improvement of the social conditions of the people," and that "it would be good, not merely for us, but for the world generally, if that expenditure on armaments which was so vast, so burdensome in its weight, could be directed to the productive enterprises of peace." But we cannot agree with him that "the Government have done what they could to testify to humanity their sense that the expenditure on armaments was excessive, by setting themselves to reduce our mass of expenditure," or that, in view of his own reiterated desire for "a nation in arms," "we, in this country, are honestly and genuinely trying to give a lead in that direction." In view of the fact that under the late Tory Government our expenditure on armaments was doubled, the reductions in expenditure that have since taken place are comparatively infinitesimal, and, manifestly, "the limit to this process" is yet far in the distance.

A Worthier Ideal.

We recognise that the Minister for War has many difficulties to face and many vested interests to fight, and that the social forces that make for a lavish expenditure on "the Services" are both powerful and well-entrenched. But if he is in earnest, and if he is well supported

1 Newcastle, September 14. 2 Newcastle, September 15.

by his colleagues in the Cabinet, it is possible to secure both efficiency and economy. As we have repeatedly pointed out, if the Army and the Navy were made, as they used to be and as they ought to be, a first charge upon the land, the very society circles which now clamour unceasingly for further expenditure upon the Army and the Navy would become the most earnest advocates of economy. Let Mr. Asquith announce his determination that, as a first step, any expenditure upon the Services in excess of the expenditure of 1894-5 shall be met by a tax upon land values, and we shall see what we shall see. Not only would the tax on land values stop the insensate clamour of the classes for increased expenditure on armaments, but by breaking down land monopoly it would enable the United Kingdom to feed, if not all her people, at all events a much greater proportion of her people on home-grown food, and thus immeasurably strengthen the Empire in case of war. That we could feed the whole of our people on home-grown food admits of no reasonable doubt, and if the Secretary for War will but set before himself this worthy ideal, instead of the unworthy ideal of "a nation in arms," he will indeed deserve well of his country and of the Empire, he will indeed give the nations of the earth a lead in the direction of disarmament and of peace.

"Race Failure."

Incidentally, too, this broadening of the basis of the national life, in place of "broadening the basis of the Army," will have the effect of checking the mental, moral and physical deterioration of the race—eliminating the root causes of consumption, of the alarming increase in lunacy, of the serious "race failure," and of the terrible infantile mortality to which Mr. W. J. Corbet,[1] Sir James Crichton Browne, and other authorities have recently called our attention. "Settle your land—fill up your vacant lands," said the late Premier of New Zealand, referring to Mr. Rooseveldt's cry of "race suicide," "and you'll fill your cradles." Mr. Seddon knew what he was talking about, because in New Zealand the cradles of the settlers do not lack occupants. And if in the United States and in this country too we will only settle the land question we shall at the same time settle the problem of "race failure" as well. Again, Sir James Crichton Browne declared in regard to tuberculosis, at the Sanitary Inspectors' Conference, Birmingham, September 14, "the 'three S's'—the seed, the soil, and the surroundings, embrace all pathology in reference to certain diseases, for while there could be no infectious disease without seed, they could not get the seed to germinate unless it was sown in suitable soil, and it would not propagate unless the surroundings were favourable"—to the disease. And, at Leeds University School of Medicine, on October 1, he said that:

[1] WESTMINSTER REVIEW for October.

"The death-rate in this country now was 16.2 per thousand, but sanitarians had calculated that the unpreventable death-rate should not exceed ten per thousand, and if that calculation were correct, the debt of Nature was each year over-paid to the extent of 200,000 lives. We were gratuitously tossing into the graveyard upwards of 50,000 infants every year." To put a stop to this "slaughter of the innocents" is a higher ideal for the nation than that of making ourselves as efficient as possible for the slaughter of our fellow-men. And the taxation and rating of land values would not only provide the funds necessary for the work of sanitation, but would also break down the barriers of land monopoly and set free the prisoners of our slums and our sweating dens, those most prolific sources of physical, mental, and moral decay.

The Church and the World.

In this connection we are very glad to see that both Church and Chapel are at length beginning to realise that "otherworldliness" is, in its way, as blameworthy as worldliness, and that the proof of a religion lies in the light and guidance it affords in regard to the great moral questions that underlie the pressing problems that confront us to-day. The Bishop of Carlisle (Dr. Diggle), speaking as President of the Church Congress at Barrow, declared that: "the world is too much in the Church and the Church too little in the world. No true Church will ever be of the world; yet will it always be, and be felt to be, in the world."[1] And he urged his hearers to "close their ranks and sink their differences, resolute to break materialism in pieces with the forces of the Spirit of God . . . the loving Father of all men, in love of whom all men of every race and Church were brethren." The Bishop of Birmingham (Dr. Gore) was also very outspoken. "The Church's appeal to the democracy (said he) remains ineffective. . . . The reason of this failure is obvious. The Church has become the Church of the rich rather than of the poor, of capital rather than labour. The opinions and prejudices which govern her administration are those of the higher classes. The Church is, in fact, engaged in perpetuating a feudal spirit in an age when such a spirit has become a disabling anachronism. Her bishops are held to be aristocrats, her clergy incarnate the spirit of the gentry and the professional classes, her system of charitable relief savours of patronage." "This sermon," he added, "is the cry of a troubled conscience which has failed clearly to see its way. The Catholic movement within the Church has failed to realise the hopes which it inspired."

[1] *Manchester Guardian*, October 3.

The Voice of Nonconformity.

The speech of the Rev. F. B. Meyer, as President of the Baptist Conference, held at Huddersfield last month, was still more frank, still more to the point. Referring first to international problems, he declared that: "in the great world of men nothing had occurred within the last few months more momentous than the proceedings of the Inter-Parliamentary Union. . . . It was now recognised that the assembly, representing twenty-two Parliaments, formulated conclusions that represented the reason and conscience of mankind. The presence of delegates from the Russian *Duma* was the presage of the day when in lands overshadowed by despotism the rights of the people should be acknowledged. In the proceedings of the conference, and notably the speeches of the Premier and Mr. Bryan, they hailed a long step toward the Magna Charta of universal peace. Then the Czar, if czars remained, would be unable to crowd the noblest of patriots into the vilest of dungeons; then inhuman monsters, like the King of the Belgians, would be unable to extort their millions by the slow torture and extermination of 15,000,000 of Congolese; then the word 'nigger' would be expunged from civilised language, the long war of colour would be ended, and young boys, fresh from school, would blush to talk of 'potting Zulus.'" Then, dealing with the difficulties and dangers that confront us here at home, he said: "The balance of power was rapidly passing from the aristocracy and the manufacturing and middle classes to the democracy. . . . Everywhere the stern test of utility was being applied. Things which could be shaken were being removed. Venerable institutions like the House of Lords, the Establishment of the Church of England, and our system of land monopoly and entail, were being summoned to the bar of public opinion to show cause for their continuance. Men were becoming imbued with the idea of racial unity. Liberals and Labour men denounced war because in their view man was brother to man the world over. That every man should have the opportunity of bringing up his family amid decent surroundings, and have a share in the comfort of God's world was becoming axiomatic. Collectivism was looking over the shoulder of individualism; competition was being set aside by co-operation; the emphasis which used to be laid on rights was now laid on duties; the spirit of social service was asserting itself on all sides; and a new world was coming into being, in which there was no room for either a Smart Set or a tramp class. Amid this universal movement they should have some message to utter, some vision to reveal, some policy to suggest. . . . They must take part in the social reconstruction of their time. . . . Men had come to believe that Christ had something to say about the injustice and wrong which lay at the root of the unrest and misery of the world. On all hands there was a

widening and deepening conviction that His mind must impress itself on the institutions of the world, if society was to be saved. In some dim way the masses looked to Christ as their leader. They must never think revolutions were of the devil. Even in their wildest forms they were due to Divine impulses. As of old, the Divine Workman was answering their daily prayer, 'Thy kingdom come,' and the present movement would bring the world to another and higher level on the spiral staircase of ascent. Society was God's building, the world His tillage."[1] These doctrines were also ably enforced by Dr. Clifford and other speakers.

A Tendency Towards Socialism.

It is to be regretted, however, that both at the Church Congress and at the Baptist Conference, there was manifest in most of the speeches dealing with these matters, as in those of Dr. Gore and the Rev. F. B. Meyer quoted above, a distinct tendency towards State Socialism. This can only be due to the fact that the rev. gentlemen responsible for these speeches have not yet sufficiently thought out the social and economic problems with which they essayed to deal. Curiously enough, the Bishop of Carlisle would seem to be nearer the truth in regard to these questions than even his brethren of the more democratic church. Speaking on October 6 he said that "in some ways he was a Socialist." But he evidently used the word in the broad sense of "social reformer," not in the strict sense of "State Socialist," for he went on to add that "He was against the land laws as they at present existed. In some ways he considered them a hindrance to the right development of the community. He did not believe that all men could be equal in life; but he would never cease to talk and struggle and fight shoulder to shoulder to secure for every man at any rate equal opportunities." Equal opportunities for all—special privileges for none, is the true solution of all our industrial and social problems. We can only hope that a further study of these problems will show the ministers of the Gospel that free and natural "co-operation by competition" is far superior to the compulsory co-operation that State Socialists aim at; and that, if we but relieve trade and industry from man-made restrictions, if we but secure to all His children of men freedom of access to "God's primitive gifts"—to use Dr. Diggle's phrase, if we but give fair-play and free-play to the natural laws—God's laws—of production and distribution, they will secure to each man his just wage, the full product of his labour.

[1] *Huddersfield Examiner*, October 6.

Closer Study Needed.

A grave responsibility rests upon the churches in regard to this matter. For ministers of the Gospel to allow to go by default the oft-repeated assertion of the Socialists that the poverty and misery we see around us are the results of the unfettered operation of natural laws—still more for ministers of the Gospel themselves to preach such doctrines is to dishonour the Creator, for natural laws are God's laws, and "shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" For ministers of the Gospel to stand idly by in the face of such poverty and misery, not lifting a finger to right the wrongs from which this poverty and misery spring, amounts to practical atheism. As Mr. Lloyd George recently declared,[1] "the responsibility for the continuance of this system of wrong must rest with the churches. . . . An alliance of the Christian churches against drink and social injustice would dominate and direct the Legislature. No influence, no monopoly could stand against it. Is it, he asked, too much to expect? Shall it be said by those who scoff at religion that the Christian churches only put forth the whole of their strength when they fight each other? Half the enthusiasm and energy spent on both sides over the education controversy would raise myriads of the poor from the mire and the needy from the dung-hill." But if they would right "this system of wrong" the churches must first make a close and careful study of the science of political economy, for the problems involved are economic problems. And to assist them in their study of these great problems, to assist them in their task of helping on "the coming of the Kingdom," we cannot do better than urge them to "read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest" the great works in which Henry George has harmonised ethics and economics, has justified the ways of God to man.

Liberalism *v.* Socialism.

It is needful, further, that the Liberal party—not the rank and file only, but the leaders, many of them as well—should study far more closely than they have yet done these vital economic problems. It is from this point of view all to the good, that the "Keir Hardie-ites" have exhibited the domineering, bureaucratic spirit of State Socialism in their repeated attempts to drive such Labour leaders as Richard Bell, Tom Burt, Charles Fenwick, John Wilson, Fred Maddison, Havelock Wilson, and others out of political life. We are inclined to believe that in the recent trials of strength, both in the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants and in the Miners' Federation, the Socialists have reached their high-water mark, and that the large body of trade unionists who have hitherto held aloof will now bear a hand in the fight and rescue the organisation of the L.R.C. and the funds of their Trade Unions from the control

[1] Penrhyndeudraeth, September 25.

of the I.L.P. And it is all to the good that the intemperate speeches of Mr. Keir Hardie, Mr. Philip Snowden, and others have at length goaded the Liberal whips into declaring war upon State Socialism. The case for Liberalism, as against Socialism, has been too long allowed to go by default. As Mr. Lloyd George admitted at the Welsh National Liberal Convention,[1] "up to the present there has been no real effort to counteract the Socialist mission amongst the workmen." But if the fight against State Socialism is to be won, Liberals must know better than to protest, with Mr. Tebbutt of Bluntisham, at the meeting of the Eastern Counties' Liberal Federation,[2] "against the abolition of a Second Chamber and of hereditary legislators" because of "the tremendous fight . . . looming in the distance between those who regard property and those who do not." The particular form of "property" that the hereditary legislators in the "House of Landlords" are chiefly concerned in is not a form of property that true Liberals regard with approval. They must know better, too, than to say with Mr. Winston Churchill,[3] that "it is not possible to draw a line, either in practice or theory, between Individualism and Collectivism"—*i.e.*, State Socialism. As a matter of fact the line can be drawn, and must be very clearly drawn, both in theory and in practice. Mr. Churchill was quite right when he went on to say that "No view of society could possibly be complete which did not comprise both collective organisation and individual incentive." In some matters collective organisation and control are imperative; and what these matters are Mr. Churchill indicated when he said that "there was a growing feeling, which he shared, against allowing services which were in the nature of monopolies to pass into private hands." Natural monopolies, such as gas, water, electric light and supply, tramways, railways, telephones, &c., must be controlled by the public, for if they are controlled by private individuals or private companies they will be used to "bleed" the public. So much of collective organisation and control true Liberalism, so much true Individualism demands. But there the line must be drawn. All else should be left, under conditions that secure to all a fair field and no favour, to individual energy and enterprise.

Mr. Haldane's Ambiguities.

And Liberals must know better than to say with Mr. Haldane at Peebles[4] that "if Mr. Keir Hardie wished to nationalise land or capital or anything else, the Liberal Party would cross swords with him." If the Liberal Party fails to nationalise the railways, the canals, and the telephones, it will be false to Liberalism. And, while there is no need to "nationalise the land" in the sense of the

[1] Cardiff, October 11.
[2] Cambridge, October 11.
[3] Glasgow, October 11.
[4] *Daily News*, October 5.

State assuming the ownership and control of the land, the Liberal party is pledged to the hilt to the taxation and rating of land values; but Mr. Haldane failed to make it clear, as he should have made it clear, that, though opposed to "land nationalisation," he supports the taxation and rating of land values. Equally ambiguous is Mr. Haldane's statement that "The fundamental principle of what was called Socialism was a denial of the right of private property," and that upon this point "Liberals would take a square issue" against the Socialists. In the view of "the man in the street" "the right of private property" includes the so-called "right of private property in land." In fact, as a rule, he has been taught to regard "private property in land" as the most sacred form of property. Mr. Haldane, of course, knows that "private property in land" has no foundation either in law or in ethics. He knows that no true Liberal can even attempt to justify "private property in land." And he should have made this as clear to his audience as it must be to his own mind, for it is this very confusion between the true right of property—the right of each man to the full product of his labour—and the falsely so-called "right of property in land" that throws discredit upon all property rights and makes State Socialists of the earnest would-be reformers who fail to realise the essential difference between land and capital, between land and the products of labour.

Deeds Not Words.

But while it is important that in the fight that lies before us our utterances should be free from ambiguity, the Liberal party, at the present juncture, will be judged by its deeds rather than by its words. As Mr. Lloyd George said in his final "word for Liberals" in the Cardiff speech already referred to: "He could tell them what would make the I.L.P. movement a great and sweeping force in this country—a force that would sweep away Liberalism, amongst other things. If at the end of an average term of office it were found that the present Parliament had done nothing to cope seriously with the social condition of the people, to remove the national degradation of slums, and widespread poverty, and destitution, in a land glittering with wealth—if they shrank from attacking boldly the main causes of wretchedness, notably the drink and the vicious land system—if they did not arrest the waste of the national resources in armaments, if they did not save up, so as to be able, before many years were past, to provide an honourable sustenance for deserving old age—if they tamely allowed the House of Lords to extract all the virtue out of their Bills, so that when the Liberal Statute Book was produced it would be simply a bundle of sapless legislative fagots fit only for the fire—then a real cry would arise in the land

for a new party, and many who were present in that room would join in that cry. But if they tackled the landlords, and the brewers, and the Peers, as they had faced the parsons, and delivered the nation from the pernicious control of this confederacy of monopolists, then the Independent Labour Party would call in vain upon the working men of Britain to desert the Party that was so gallantly fighting to rid the land of the oppressions and wrongs that had overwhelmed those who laboured in it." There speaks true statesmanship. But it would have been even better if Mr. Lloyd George had pointed out (1) that in regard to one class of reforms—financial reforms, to wit—the House of Lords has no right to interfere; (2) that by the taxation of land values and of liquor licenses we can overthrow the tyranny of land monopoly and the tyranny of drink in spite of the peerage and "the beerage"; and (3) that there is no need to "save up" and to wait "many years" for Old Age Pensions, since the necessary funds can be readily obtained in next year's Budget by means of these very taxes on land values and on liquor licenses.

First Steps First.

Mr. Lloyd George showed true statesmanship also when he urged that "if the able men who now thought they were best serving the cause of progress by trying to shatter Liberalism were to devote their energies and their talents to guide, to strengthen, and to embolden it, they would render higher and more enduring service to progress, and in doing so they would be helping to guide and direct the course of a much more powerful machine than they were ever likely to command"; and when he pointed out that "no party could ever hope for success in this country which did not win the confidence of at least a large portion of the middle class. That was an asset brought by Liberalism to the work of progress which would never be transferred to a Progressive party constructed on purely Labour lines, and he would strongly urge the importance of this consideration upon those who wished to drive Liberalism out in order to substitute another organisation. They were not going to make Socialists in a hurry out of the farmers and traders and professional men of this country, but they might scare them into reaction. They were helping to secure advanced Labour legislation, they would help later on to secure land reform, and other measures for all classes of Welsh producers, and the Liberal party needed all the help they could obtain. But if they were threatened with a class war, then they would surely sulk and harden into downright Toryism." While we cannot any longer allow the case for Liberalism against State Socialism to go by default, there is, as we have shown above, a good deal of ground that is common both to

Liberalism and to Socialism. Even if Socialists desire that the State shall formally own and control the land, the taxation and rating of land values are necessary first steps in that direction. Even if the Socialists wish to nationalise all trade and all industry, the nationalisation and the municipalisation of natural monopolies are first steps in that direction. Why, then, as sensible men, cannot Liberals and Socialists alike agree to differ about the later stages of the journey, and unite upon the practical policy of "first steps first"?

No Need for a "Class War."

We cannot but believe that ere long all the truly democratic, all the earnestly progressive, all the saner elements in the Liberal party and in the Socialist party will see the wisdom of adopting this course; and that the impracticable, senseless "class war," Liberal-party-smashing intransigents will be left to their own devices. There is, in truth, no need whatever for a "class war" in this country. Not even for a "war" against the landed classes. In every class, happily, there are to be found men who rise superior to the bias and to the selfish interest of their class, and who, against the selfish interest of their class, advocate what they believe to be good for the nation as a whole. Such men are to be found even in the landlord class; and of this Lord Carrington (the present Minister of Agriculture) is a notable example. We war against landlordism, not against the landlords as a class. We are convinced, indeed, that if a man of such sterling character as, for instance, the Duke of Devonshire, who refused to follow Mr. Chamberlain in his advocacy of the taxation of food, though he himself, as an agricultural landlord, stood to gain largely by such a policy—we are convinced that if such a man had the imagination, the historical knowledge, and the economic insight to see things as they really are; if he could see how unjust and how disastrous to our nation is the landlord system by which he personally profits; that it drives our people from the soil to herd in the slums; that it is destructive alike of the physical, the mental, and the moral fibre of our race; that to the extent that landlordism secures to him wealth that he has not earned, it inevitably deprives others of wealth that they have earned; that to the extent that he receives without producing, others must produce without receiving; that every hundred thousand pounds of land value received by himself and his class means so many men, women, and children crowded into the slums, and toiling in the sweating dens long hours for starvation wages, means so many men driven by want into vagrancy and crime, so many women driven by hunger to sell themselves on the streets for bread, means so many children done to death by slow

starvation, and so many more stunted in physique and rendered degenerate in mind and in morals by sheer privation—we are convinced, we repeat, that if his grace of Devonshire could realise the truth of all this, could see things as they really are, he would become one of the most earnest advocates of the taxation of land values, and that he would, to the utmost of his power, use his immense wealth and influence to right the wrong that he—a victim of circumstances as truly as the sufferers we have mentioned—has for so long unthinkingly profited by.

ARMAMENTS AND PEACE.

"It is in the interest of peace that I urge the Government to put no pressure on their naval advisers to modify their opinions, and that I earnestly request that, whatever be the changes which they desire to introduce into the army and navy, they will not make those changes of a kind which will weaken the forces which undoubtedly in the past have conduced to peace."—Mr. BALFOUR, Debate on the Navy Estimates, July 27.

"Let them not forget that the naval peace which England had enjoyed for the past fifty years was entirely owing to the recognised invincibility of our naval supremacy, and the day they imperilled this supremacy our era of peace would be doomed to early extinction."—Mr. LEE, Debate on the Navy Estimates.

"This phrase about peace being secured by diminished armaments might sound well in some ears, but the fact remained that a strong British navy was the best safeguard we could have for European peace."—Earl CAWDOR, in the House of Lords, July 30.

"I hold that the growth of armaments is a great danger to the peace of the world."—Sir HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, in the Albert Hall, December 21, 1905.

THE foregoing extracts from recent speeches of statesmen all bear on the same subject—the relation of armaments to peace. The first three, all the utterances of men who had a large measure of responsibility in the military policy of the late Government, are examples of the doctrine that the way to secure peace is to prepare for war. The other, from our Premier, expresses a view in direct opposition to this doctrine. Thus there exists among the men who share from time to time in the guidance of the State, as among those whom they represent, not merely a difference, but a complete opposition of opinion on one of the most important questions of State policy. It is clear that one or the other of these opinions is erroneous; that when the policy based on the erroneous opinion is applied the State is misguided; and that, by being periodically subject to the control of each, our State policy must be one of constant reversals. That there is a call for the investigation of the subject is evident. The end sought—the avoidance of war—is one of such importance that to allow the matter to stand as it is, instead of endeavouring to sift the error from the truth, so that we may fix on a policy with some degree of confidence in its soundness, could not be characterised

as other than sheer mental torpor. Surely we desire the guidance of our national policy to be not utterly unintelligent. And it is not the importance of the end alone that necessitates such an inquiry. One policy calls for more and more expenditure, while the other checks expenditure; and our outlay for this purpose has reached such a pitch that any possibility of finding relief ought to have very serious attention.

The purpose is to avoid war. The best way to attain this end, we are told by one section, is to prepare for war. How will preparing for war tend to prevent war? We are not told: those who promulgate this doctrine don't give the rationale, so we must seek it.

What is the exact meaning of this doctrine? The phrase which expresses it proves on examination to be of a very indefinite nature. We are to "prepare for war." If we were quite unprepared for war—if we were without army and navy, these words would have a definite meaning; the meaning would be that we ought to have an armed force; but as we are already prepared for war it is evident that the words are not used in the literal sense. What the supporters of this doctrine mean is that we ought to have further preparation for war. But how much further? To this question they have given no answer. They do not fix any degree of preparedness as the point we must reach to attain the greatest security of peace. Their cry is ever for more, and more, and more. If we are to give any clear meaning to this doctrine then, what can it be but this: the more we prepare for war, the more likely are we to avoid it; and since we value peace very highly, we cannot devote too much of our time to making engines of destruction and exercising ourselves in the use of them. The more, the better.

How will increase of armaments tend to preserve peace? To take a somewhat lawless community, to exemplify the working of the theory, among whom fighting is not uncommon: would an increased arming of the turbulent elements commend itself to a man of sense as a means of making fighting less frequent and less disastrous? To have more and better weapons would not make them less disposed to fight; it would only facilitate the expression of their fighting disposition, and thus cause them to fight oftener. Is the case of the nations different from this? Would an increased arming of the nations tend more to preserve peace among the nations than an increased arming of individuals would tend to prevent fighting between individuals? It is difficult to see it.

This, however, is not what the upholders of the prepare-for-war doctrine mean, as a little study of their words makes clear. It is not a general increase of armaments that they desire—that would not be to the purpose at all—but an increase of our own armaments only. Their aim is to have our nation so much more strongly armed than the others that they dare not attack us. It seems

questionable whether some do mean this; whether they have anything more in their minds than a vague idea that the more strongly we are armed the greater is our security, in that we are better able to repel attack. But where is the logic in this? Increase of power to repel attack is not synonymous with prevention of war; nor does it, in itself, even tend toward it. It is evidently assumed that just in proportion as we increase our armaments, so do we lessen the likelihood of being attacked. But the assumption is not warranted: it is not necessarily so. If the increase be such as to secure a very marked advantage over possible attackers, it will in some degree lessen the risk of attack, but not otherwise. It is difficult to find the least logical ground for supporters of the prepare-for-war doctrine who do not go all the way for absolute supremacy. In that position there is logic. Nations don't usually enter war without comparing their strength with their opponents', and unless they think they have a fair chance of success; therefore, if we can attain a position of great advantage in size of armaments, other nations will be more cautious of making war against us.

It appears to be good reasoning; but it is, after all, a conditional deduction: there are variable factors in the situation which may quite upset the reckoning. A nation's power to succeed in war cannot be exactly measured by the number of its men in arms and battleships: the possession of certain qualities of mind may more than counterbalance a great disadvantage in size of armaments. How often has it happened that a nation which relied on its superior numerical strength has been defeated! Have we not a very modern instance of the great and arrogant being brought low? All men know this, and though we may gain a position of very considerable advantage in size of armaments, the difference between the resources of our own and other nations is not such that the others could not, if they determined on it, place themselves in a position to cope with us. The knowledge that their opponents have superior strength makes a people cautious of entering war, and thus delays hostility, but they husband their strength and watch for favourable opportunity; and it is very uncertain that the consideration of a nation of their opponents, superior strength would cause wars to be much less frequent.

Then, if such a position of advantage be gained, can it be kept? We succeeded some years ago in establishing a naval supremacy. The result has been—what a study of the situation would lead one to expect—to give a great and general stimulus to increase of naval forces. The fact is, the nations will not be satisfied to have one people dominant, and thus in a position to dictate to them; and naturally they have endeavoured to balance our navy by increasing theirs. As we increase our force further to maintain

our supremacy, they also will increase theirs; and so on, till it will end—how? This manner of avoiding war threatens to be as disastrous as war itself. It is clear that if we persist in this attempt to have a supremacy, and if the other nations persist in their efforts to prevent being outclassed, we shall be involved in a general ruin. We can keep our supremacy, then, only by the other nations ceasing their efforts to keep their naval forces near to ours, and this does not seem likely.

A defect which an impartial inquirer sees at once in this doctrine is that it is not a disinterested method of securing peace, but a selfish scheme of dominancy. It is not a fair method. It is one that would not be agreeable to us if another nation were to be the dominant factor of the situation. It is a method of preventing war which, if adopted by all the nations, would bring on general ruin. It suggests other methods, by carrying the same principle further. To instance: if a man, living on an island with a few others, could only put them all in chains, he would, by thus depriving them of opportunity to fight him, secure peace. Perhaps even a simpler way would be to give each a sufficiently hard knock on the head. But are not these questionable ways of attaining a good end?

Is it likely that any capable and impartial man, if he should be entrusted with the choosing of a method of preventing war among the nations, would choose that of giving one nation a dominancy? Certainly not. This is the choice of partiality. It is a choice not with a view to the general well-being, but from the narrower considerations of the safety of one's nation only. It is not a method to secure peace, but a plan to prevent others from hurting us while giving us power to punish them. It is evident to the impartial observer that as the risk of war is decreased by the fear of the weaker to engage with the stronger, exactly in the same degree is it likely to be increased from the stronger being less cautious of making war. We have in our recent history an illustration of this disadvantage of the scheme. Two years ago our Government ran very near to plunging us into war with another great people over what was purely a blunder on the part of two or three naval officers. This dreadful incaution seems only explainable by our consciousness of our great advantage in striking force.

In the view on which the prepare-for-war doctrine rests, the gross mistake is made of taking men as insensate automata. The upholders of the doctrine frequently allude to "human nature" as necessitating their policy, but in this matter human nature has been overlooked. What is human nature? Man is not an insensate creature, but a being of thought and feeling, a being who loves and hates. The relation between human beings is a mutual one: men act on each other by reciprocal influence. What one man's attitude

toward another is, depends chiefly on the other's attitude to him. He who uses others fairly and kindly wins their reverence and love. By his beneficent attitude to them he makes their attitude to him such that he has no need to arm himself against them. But he who uses others inconsiderately and unjustly rouses their resentment and hatred, and disposes them to resist him. In considering the means of preserving peaceful relations, whether between individuals or between nations, ought not this truth to be kept in mind? If for no higher motive than to avoid war, would it not be wise to aim at winning the other nations to a friendly disposition, and to take care to avoid conduct that may provoke hostility? Is it not better to have peace preserved through a friendly disposition on both sides, than through the fear of the others of our being able to crush them? A people's affection is won to another people by sympathy and help, and their enmity is directed to those who treat them unfairly. But this is no part of the philosophy of the prepare-for-war doctrine. Sentiment is a thing of no consideration. Let them love us or let them hate us, it is of little account whether: the one thing of importance is to be able to crush them if they should dare to oppose us. Thus ignoring the psychic aspect of the problem, they blunder into an attitude of provocation. By attempting to gain a dominancy, and thus denying a fair standing to other nations, we are certain to provoke hostility and cause them to resist us.

To summarise the finding:—The doctrine that the way to secure peace is to prepare for war is not an impartial method of avoiding war, but a selfish scheme of dominancy. If we attempt to keep a dominancy it will result in a national rivalry in armaments which will be disastrous to all. Though the marked supremacy of one nation makes the other nations cautious of attacking it, there is a proportionately increased risk from the dominant nation being more prone to enter war. Finally, from being a scheme of dominancy, it engenders hostility, and thus actually creates the conditions that tend to bring on war.

What now of the view and policy of the opposing section? What do they deem the best method to secure peace? As they hold that increase of armaments increases the risk of war, it may be supposed that they would reduce them. Would they abolish our armed forces altogether, or, if not, to what extent would they reduce them?

Those who oppose the advocates of increased armaments regard the great armaments of Europe and the vast labours for mutual destruction as a menace to civilisation and a monstrous anachronism. They regard these armaments as the patent signs of discord and hostility between peoples whose interests are alike and who ought to live in harmony. They regard increase of armaments as tending

to make this bad situation worse, by engendering more mistrust and antagonism, therefore they would check the increase. The steady increase of recent years they regard, from the point of view of the general well-being of mankind, as a retrograde movement, and they wish to stem this backward current and turn it the other way. They do not aim to sweep away armaments at once, nor to make a great immediate drop, but they firmly aim at reduction, if only slow. It is not by any particular size of armaments, however, that they expect to secure peace: they aim to avoid war by taking away its causes. Their idea is not that of a small army instead of a large army, but that of international justice instead of national self-assertion. They aim to secure peace rather by having other peoples well-disposed to us than by intimidating them with great armaments. They would have us deal justly with other nations and cultivate friendly relations with them. Chief of all, they aim to have the civilised nations recognise the wickedness of the practice of fighting each other over their affairs of difference, and to win them to make it a practice to settle all these affairs by appeal to a judicial authority.

This question of how best to secure peace is evidently another to the many which already press on the public mind for solution May we not hope that ere long our people will awaken to the need of intelligent investigation of questions of this kind, and require in the conduct of State policy, instead of ill-founded opinions, that accurate knowledge which is required in the pursuit of less important ends; and that, as a result, we shall have a more intelligent pursuit of peace?

HARRY HODGSON

FOUNDING AN IRISH UNIVERSITY.

THE foundation of a university for the higher education of the Catholic people of Ireland, who are three-fourths of the population, has for a great number of years been a moot question. For a time the debate rather languished, but of late the logomachy—the war of words, has been renewed despite the authoritative pronouncements of the Catholic hierarchy and clergy, in which *inter alia* they condemn the attitude of a few Catholic laymen who appear to think that upon the Protestant University, known as Trinity College, Dublin, it may be possible to engraft a real Catholic University, to endow it as richly, and to make it equally free and independent in its own sphere of action, for that is the trend of their suggestions, as T.C.D. itself. The intention may be good, but what a paradox! A Protestant and a Catholic university harmonizing! Is it possible to make a good graft on a hostile and unsuitable stock? Figs do not grow on thistles, or grapes on thorns. All the wit of man could not get a scion, however good and sound in itself, to "take" under such adverse circumstances—in other words, to unite with an antagonistic stock, and draw sustenance and vitality from its alien sap; even if there might be a sort of union, the offshoot would be unreproductive—a hybrid foredoomed to decay.

A thoughtful and distinguished man of letters, a Protestant and an Englishman, Professor Goldwin Smith, published many years ago an article on "The Greatness of England" in which he extolled his own country to the skies; but at the same time he was not altogether blinded by prejudice, or biased by religious or political considerations. He wrote:

"Speculation on unfulfilled contingencies is not invariably barren. It is interesting at all events to consider what would have been the consequences to the people of the two islands, and to humanity generally, if a Saxon England and a Celtic Ireland had been allowed to grow up and develop by the side of each other. . . . In the case of Ireland, we should have been saved centuries of oppression which has profoundly reacted, as oppression always does, on the character of the oppressor; and it is difficult to believe that the Isle of Saints and of primitive universities would not have produced some good fruits of its own."

---

[1] *Fortnightly Review*, December 1878.

These are considerate words, pregnant with meaning, and indicate clearly what was passing in the mind of a learned English writer, thirty years ago. They are now well worth recalling as having a bearing on the subject under discussion. Thinking on the lines of Goldwin Smith's commentary it is not difficult to imagine what good fruits would have been the result if a free and independent Catholic University "had been allowed to grow up and develop" in Ireland on equal terms in all respects with Trinity College, Dublin. Professor Goldwin Smith, like the late Mr. Gladstone, has the courage of his convictions, and does not hesitate to say that "the conquest of Ireland was completed with circumstances of cruelty sufficient to plant undying hatred in the breast of the people"; and in the spirit of a true believer in ethical doctrine he denounces the action of the British Government in these terms:

"Irish history studied impartially is a grand lesson in political charity; so clear is it that in those deplorable annals, the more important part was played by adverse circumstances, the less important by the malignity of man. That the stronger nation is entitled by the law of force to conquer its weaker neighbour and to govern the conquered in its own interest is a doctrine which civilised morality abhors."

Most people will think that "the malignity of man," not mere "adverse circumstances" was the mainspring of English action in Ireland; in which action it cannot be denied Trinity College, Dublin, played an important part and not merely that of *amicus curiæ*, as will be clearly shown in the following pages. "The College of the holy and undivided Trinity of Queen Elizabeth, near Dublin" such is the official designation, style and title of the celebrated university, now engaging the attention of Statesmen, learned divines and laymen, learned or unlearned, as printed in "The Charter and Statutes" upon which it was founded and richly endowed out of the plunder and confiscation of Catholic property. Its foundation stone was quarried by the hands of predatory adventurers, whom Goldwin Smith has mildly described as "intruders"; dressed and squared by the chisel and hammer of persecution, and laid and bedded in mortar moistened by the blood and tears of an afflicted nation. Broad, based not upon the will of the people of Ireland but of their hereditary oppressors and persecutors, it was built up and buttressed by the exertions of self-interested, audacious and unscrupulous men eager to get up in the world by hook or by crook. It has lived an unhealthy and feverish existence for over three centuries never once losing sight of the object for which it was originally founded. The very plainest of plain speaking must necessarily be employed in dealing with this question, and with the aims and intentions of the Foundress of Trinity College, Dublin, and her advisers. What

were those aims and intentions? Their vital element was hatred of the Catholic religion and a desperate resolve, as will presently appear, to adopt what is known as "the clean slate policy" and to wipe catholicity out of existence in Ireland. The records of religious persecution furnish the most amazing chapter in the history of the human race. The ruthless savagery of the persecutors and the splendid endurance and constancy of the persecuted, from the days when the early Christians sought refuge in the catacombs, or were thrown to the wild beasts in the amphitheatre of Vespasian, familiarly known as the Colosseum in Rome, and which furnished Gustav Doré, the famous French painter, with the idea of one of his greatest masterpieces, form the most striking features in the grim narrative and indicate plainly on which side truth and righteousness are to be found.

In general terms to persecute means to pursue in a manner calculated to injure, vex, or afflict, to cause to suffer pain from hatred or malignity, to harass; especially to afflict, harass, or punish for adherence to a particular creed, or system, or religious principles, or to a mode of worship. The question is one, therefore, in which the principles of good and evil are arrayed on opposite sides as they have always been from the creation of the world until now, ever since the day on which the first murderer struck down his innocent brother at the foot of the first altar ever raised for the worship of God. It is not necessary to seek for an illustration in pre-christian times when the Israelites of old, the chosen people who were admittedly the precursors of the Christians, were subjected to the tortures and indignities inflicted upon them by their imperial task-masters, the cruel Pharaos and their ruthless myrmidons. No layman can write with authority upon a theological subject, and this REVIEW is not the proper place for a dissertation on religious matters, but it may be permissible to make a passing reference to sacred things when contrasting truth and falsehood, good and evil, righteousness and unrightousness, the persecutors and the persecuted. It is written in the pages of sacred history that when the Redeemer came upon earth he came to establish a new religion—Christianity, peace and goodwill to men—in place of the Mosaic dispensation which sanctioned the doctrine of retaliation—"an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." In His sublime Sermon upon the Mount He inculcated, in a few words, what must ever be regarded as the groundwork of Christian ethics, "Do unto others as you would wish others to do unto you," singling out for the highest rewards, both in the here and the hereafter, all those who suffer persecution for justice sake. I have before me as I write, what, without any exaggeration, may be described as a bewildering mass of materials, a plethora of works of reference; amongst many others "The Book of Trinity College,

Dublin, 1591–1891," the authorship of which belongs to several distinguished members of the University whose names are given in the table of contents. The frontispiece is copied from a characteristic and well-known portrait of Queen Elizabeth in her hideous farthingale, diamond stomacher and ruffs. The first line of the first chapter of this extraordinary work reads thus: "The origin of the University of Dublin is not shrouded in darkness." *In limine* this frank declaration is very satisfactory, especially on account of the high authority upon which it is made, and the fact that it clears the ground, like the axed pioneers of an invading army on the onward march over a rough country, by clearing all obstacles out of the way and removing the possibility of controversy or cavil on the cardinal point—the object for which Trinity College, Dublin, was founded. The name "College of the holy and undivided Trinity of *Queen Elizabeth*" jars upon the ear. It has a sacrilegious sound, and brings to mind the despatch attributed to the Russian general, Suwarrow, after the sack of Ismail, the massacre of its brave defenders, and the abandonment of the city and its inhabitants to the fury of his brutal soldiers—"Glory to God and to the Empress, Ismail's ours"—substitute Queen for Empress, Ireland for Ismail, and the paraphrase is perfect. Well, on pp. 4–5 is printed a copy of the original Warrant, given under the hand of the Queen, dated December 29, 1592, of which the following is an extract:

"Wee perceive that the Major and the citizens of Dublin are very well disposed to grant the scite of the Abbey of All-hallows belonging to the said city to the yearly value of twenty pounds to serve for a College for learning, whereby knowledge and civility might be increased by the instruction of our people there, whereof many have usually heretofore used to travaile to Ffrance, Italy and Spain to get learning in such foreigne Universities, whereby they have been infected with poperie and other ill qualities and soe become evill subjects."

The following note is appended to the Warrant:

"Stubbs history of the University of Dublin, Appendix iii., p. 534. None of the histories note that there were foreign Colleges founded by Irish priests for the Irish at this very time in Salamanca (opened 1592), Lisbon (1593), Douai (1594). Thus there was an active policy to be counteracted by Elizabeth, and these professed foundations were probably set before her by Henry Ussher as a pressing danger. Some account of the constitution of the Salamanca Seminary is given in Hogan's *Hibernia Ignatiana* Appendix, p. 238. The students were to be exclusively of Irish parentage."[1]

Many friends of Trinity College, Dublin, will think it would have been better if this record of bigotry and intolerance had been "shrouded in darkness," or that the recording angel had "dropped

1 Dr. Doyle (J.K.L.), the great Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, received his education at Lisbon.

a tear upon [the words and blotted them out for ever." *Litera Scripta mânet.* It is now too late for any hope of salvation, but by those infallible means, by which evil doers can always obtain forgiveness for their crimes, repentance, amendment and restitution.

As there is a great deal to be said about the Elizabethan period it is as well to conclude my references to the Foundress of Trinity College, Dublin, by a brief statement of how Catholic Ireland was treated during her reign. There is a very terrible and instructive work, dealing with this subject, called the *Pacata Hibernia*, from which some extracts shall be cited as to the methods of pacification employed by Queen Elizabeth's representatives,—Deputies was the official title in Ireland—of whom there were several, The two Earls of Essex, Earl Grey de Wilton, Sir Arthur Chichester, Malby, Sir George Carew, Sir Walter Raleigh, Sir Charles Coote. Francis Cosby, Sir William Drury, and several others. The premier place, as a predatory adventurer, must be given to the first Earl of Essex, not Elizabeth's favourite courtier, who was the second Earl. In August 1573 he embarked at Liverpool and landed in Antrim. Richey says:

"His dealings with the native chiefs seem almost a counterpart of those of the Spaniards with the Mexican caciques. . . . To secure to himself the coveted estates he invited Brian O'Neill and his retinue to a repast; after three days feasting, Camden states that he put to the sword two hundred of the Irish, and took Brian, Rory Oge his brother, and Brian's wife to Dublin, where they were cut in quarters."

The record proceeds: "He (Essex) was involved in constant hostilities, and was guilty of the greatest atrocities towards the natives. He endorsed and approved the massacre, by treachery and in cold blood, of 400 of the Scots on Rathlin Island." Writing to the Queen after the massacre he tells her that "the soldiers hold back from no travail in her service, and this done in the Raghlins, so do I find them full willing to follow it, until they shall have ended what your Majesty intendeth to have done." It may be assumed Essex knew her Majesty's mind well. Despite his savage ferocity, Richey says of him: "He was a pure-minded, chivalrous Christian gentleman after the fashion of his day. The killing on the Bann and the massacre of Rathlin did not lie heavy on his soul." As a further indication of the extraordinary leniency with which some English writers of note have regarded the butchery of the Catholic Irish at this period the following opinions of Froude are interesting: "Notwithstanding Rathlin, Essex was one of the noblest of living Englishmen, and that such a man could have ordered such a deed, being totally unconscious of the horror of it, is not the least instructive feature in the dreadful story." The Barony of Farney in the County of Monaghan was granted to him

by Queen Elizabeth as a reward for his services. The first Earl of Essex died in Dublin in 1596. His son, the second Earl, having distinguished himself in the low countries when not twenty years of age was, we read, "taken into the greatest favour by Queen Elizabeth, was kept constantly near her, and advanced to the highest offices in the State." The history of Elizabeth's favourite courtier is so well known it is unnecessary to give further details. They quarrelled, and, like Henry the Eighth's wives, Essex lost his head upon the block, verifying the truth of Virgil's line, *varium et mutabile semper femina.* Happily, instances are rare in which feminine caprice proceeded to such extreme lengths. It is well-known to scientists how surely mental and physical characteristics are transmitted from parents to offspring. Galton, Darwin and others have given numerous examples. The ruthless disposition of Henry, a monarch, as history records, who never spared man in his anger or woman in his lust, was evidently passed on to his daughter Elizabeth. The next notable Deputy in Ireland of the Foundress of Trinity College, Dublin, was Sir Arthur Chichester who had to fly from England as Lodge puts it, "for robbing one of the Queen's purveyors who were but little better than robbers themselves." He fled to Ireland, which was then, as now, the *refugium peccatorum*, the dumping-place for predatory adventurers from England; and soon became a *persona grata* by reason of his savage treatment of the Catholic Irish. He was knighted in 1595, according to Lodge, for

> "his skill in the wars of this kingdom (Ireland), where his service in the reduction of the Irish to due obedience was so manifest that he was effectually assistant to plough and break up that barbarous nation by conquest, and then sow it with seeds of civility . . . in 1603–4 he was made Lord Deputy by Queen Elizabeth, and resolutely set about extending the circuits in Ireland, abolishing the old laws and customs, and endeavouring to make the people Protestant."

This Lord Deputy has left a written record of the plan he adopted to pacify the northern province as follows:

> "I have often said and written, it is famine must consume the Irish, as our swords and other endeavours worked not that speedy effect which is expected; hunger would be a better, because a speedier weapon to employ against them than the sword. . . . I burned all along Lough Neagh . . . sparing none, of what quality, age or sex soever, besides many burned to death. We killed man, woman and child, horse, beast or whatever we could find."

Malby, President of Connaught, in his official report to Government, quoted by Froude, tells how he pacified the western province. The Irish chiefs made an attempt to save their people by a policy of submission, and here is how their overtures were received. Malby says:

"I thought good to take another course, and so with determination to consume them with fire and sword, sparing neither old nor young, I entered their mountains. I burnt all their corn and houses, and committed to the sword all that could be found. . . . In like manner I assaulted a castle where the garrison surrendered. I put them to the misericordia of my soldiers—they were all slain; thence I went on, sparing none which came in my way, which cruelty did so amaze their followers they could not tell where to bestow themselves. It was all done in rain and frost and storm journeyings in such weather bringing them the sooner to submission."

In the southern province the work of pacification was entrusted to Sir George Carew. A short extract or two from the *Pacata Hibernia* will be more than enough to show how faithfully he carried out his instructions as a pacificator. These instructions are of an elaborate and minute character, extending from p. 10 to p. 34 of vol. i., and placed the province of Munster at the mercy of one of the most sanguinary monsters who ever lived. They enjoined upon him "to prosecute and oppress any rebell or rebells with sword and with fire" (p. 17). It was not thought sufficient to place the power of life and death in his hands; he was empowered to put his victims to the torture. The instruction on this point is as follows:

"It shall be lawfull . . . after examination in the causes necessary upon vehement suspicion and presumption of any great offence, in any partie, committed against the Queen's Majestie to put the said partie so suspected to tortures as they think convenient and as the cause shall require."[1] Here is how the Queen's representative in Munster interpreted the instructions he was given:

"The President (Carew) having received certaine information that the Mounster fugitives were harbored in those parts, having before burned all the houses and corne, and taken great preyzes in Owny Omulrian and Kilquig, a strong and fast countrey, not farre from Limerick, diverted his forces into east Clanwilliam and Muskry-quirke . . . and harrasing the country, killed all mankind that were found therein for a terrour to those as should give reliefe to the runagate traitors; thence we came to Arloghe woods, where we did the like not leaving behind us man or beast, corne or cattle."[2]

The "Arloghe" here mentioned is the Glen of Aherlow in the County of Tipperary, so admired by tourists for its scenic beauty.

One or two other instances of the treacherous and sanguinary nature of Elizabeth's representatives and I shall pass on from the consideration of this period of the agony of Catholic Ireland to cite some instances of the persecutions, robbery and confiscation carried out under the rule of some of her successors. We have it on record that when the Fortress of Smerwick in the south of Ireland

[1] *Pacata Hibernia*, vol. i. p. 23. [2] *Ibid.*, vol. i. pp. 189–190.

as surrendered to Lord Grey de Wilton "the officers were reserved r ransom, and next day the garrison, about 600 men, were aughtered in cold blood, and a few women and a priest amongst iem were hung. The bodies, 600 in all, were stripped and laid nt on the sands—'as gallant and goodly personages,' says Grey, as ever were beheld.'" Sir Walter Raleigh was one of the fficers who commanded the party who carried out Lord Grey's rders in massacring the garrison. Strange to say, Froude has ttempted to justify this horrible butchery by saying "it was but he natural and *obvious* method of disposing of an enemy who had eserved no quarter . . . he probably could not, if he had wished, ave conveyed so large a body of prisoners in safety across Ireland o Dublin." But what about the non-combatants, the women and he priest who were hanged? Froude says Lord Grey was recalled o England at his own request. However, a historian of less note, Cox, but one equally sympathetic with the English methods of Government in Ireland, informs us "This good Deputy . . . was epresented at the Court of England as a bloody man, that regarded iot the lives of the subjects any more than the lives of dogs but iad tyrannised with that barbarity that there was little left for the Queen to reign over but carcases and ashes." However, Lord Grey's savage action may be regarded from a military point of view, on the ground that it was "only an incident of war," the inhuman torture of Doctor O'Hurley, Archbishop of Cashel, by Queen Elizabeth's Deputies in Ireland, can find no such palliation. Bishops, priests and nuns were special objects of their malevolence, and these they persecuted with a fertility of inventive cruelty that could only emanate from the author of evil. Doctor O'Hurley was arrested on the evidence of an infamous informer named Barnewell. The facts are given in the correspondence between the Lords Justices and the Council in England, and will be found in vols. civ. to cviii. in the public Record Office, London, under the head "Ireland." The then Chief Secretary, Wallop, finding the Archbishop steadfast in repudiating the accusations of the informer, wrote to her Majesty's acting Chief Secretary, under date December 10, 1583: "We want here either rack or other engine of torture to terrify him." The record proceeds, the law officers of the day, finding no legal evidence against the Archbishop as stated in a subsequent letter of Wallop's, "think it better, O'Hurley having neither lands nor goods, that he be executed by martial law rather than by ordinary trial." In the further examinations had before the Lords Justices, Doctor O'Hurley again denied the charges made against him by the informer, and was inhumanly tortured under the authority of her Majesty's Council as recorded by Wallop in a letter addressed to Sir Francis Walsingham, principal Secretary to her Majesty, dated March 7, 1584. Having failed by questioning

to extract any admission of guilt, Sir Henry Wallop's official report goes on to say: "Not finding that easy manner of examination to do any good, we made commission to Mr. Waterhouse and Mr. Secretary Fenton to put him to the torture, such as your honour advised us, which was to toast his feet to the fire with hot boots." The following account of the torture is recorded by one who had the facts from eye-witnesses[1]: "The executioners placed the Archbishop's feet and calves in tin boots, filled with oil; they then fastened his feet in wooden shackles or stocks, and placed fire under them. The boiling oil so penetrated the feet and legs that morsels of the skin and flesh fell off and left the bone bare." Dr. O'Hurley was afterwards taken out from his dungeon in Dublin Castle and hanged. Another illustrious victim of England's merciless rule was the Most Revd. Dr. Oliver Plunket, Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of all Ireland. He was falsely accused of conspiring against the Government. His chief accuser, amongst others, was an apostate friar named McMoyer, whom Doctor Plunket had suspended for various crimes and who was noted for his violence, drunkenness and immoralities. Dr. Burnet, the Protestant Bishop, refers to the informers produced at the trial as follows: "The witnesses were brutal, profligate men, yet the Earl of Shaftesbury cherished them much, they were examined by the Parliament at Westminster and what they said was believed." A Grand Jury of the County Dublin would not find the bill on the evidence of McMoyer and the rest. Government next attempted to try the Archbishop at Dundalk, but the character of the witnesses being known there they refused to appear, and Murphy, the second witness, fled in terror out of the kingdom. Doctor Plunket's innocence is attested by numbers of Protestant writers of unquestionable authority, but the Government meant murder, and the venue, as in more recent times, was changed to London. He was, of course, convicted and was hanged, drawn and quartered at Tyburn. The foregoing citations from authentic historical sources are humiliating reading for all conscientious and humane people. The horror of it all can only be accurately described in the scathing language of the great and righteous statesman, W. E. Gladstone, who, commenting on the terrible persecutions of the people of Ireland at a much later period (1798) in the July number of the *Nineteenth Century Review*, 1889, wrote:

> "It was in truth a madness of murders . . . upon the whole the wild beast that is in man has never, so far as my knowledge goes, been more effectually let loose. . . . But the ferocity which marked the war was less dreadful and less guilty than the work of murder and ruin prosecuted wholesale by the forces of the Crown after the rebellion was extinguished."

The late Mr. Gladstone will be accepted by the majority of

[1] *Stanihurst*, pp. 29, 30.

Englishmen as an unsuspected witness. His testimony has been here introduced to confirm the evidence of those who have left, under their own hands, records of the enormities perpetrated by the representatives of the English Government in Ireland—*litera scripta manet.* It was my intention to refer briefly to the murderous policy of Great Britain at later periods, and to cite passages from the annals of persecution during the rule of Cromwell, Charles II., William III., Anne, Georges I., II., and III., down to the year 1798, the passage of the so-called Act of Union, and the famine of 1845–6. It would be, however, impossible to compress within the limits allowed for a magazine article, even the merest outline of the tortures, the indignities, the opprobrium the Catholics of Ireland had to endure at the hands of the British Government. It has been no congenial task to recall the miseries of Ireland under the persecutions and misrule of the British Government. It is all very well to say let bygones be bygones. Wrongs, however great, can be forgiven, but it is impossible they can be forgotten; and there is, moreover, a condition precedent to their being forgiven; in the late Mr. Gladstone's noble words, "they must be confessed, repented, and repaired." In dealing with the foundation of Trinity College, Dublin, it was my intention to have referred to such matters as "the depositions," the perjured evidence got up for the purpose of exciting hostility against the Catholics prior to the war of 1641. The broken treaty of Limerick and Bishop Dopping's celebrated sermon, preached before the Lords Justices, who signed the treaty on the part of William III., inveighing against the crime of keeping faith with Papists, but I have reached the limits of my space and must conclude. I am sorry it has fallen to my lot to turn the search-light of truth upon the circumstances under which Trinity College, Dublin, came into existence. It cannot be forgotten, however, that some of the greatest and most self-sacrificing Protestant patriots who ever lived studied within its halls, but that does not affect the aims and intentions of its founders. Edmund Burke, who denounced the penal laws against Catholic Ireland in language that can never be forgotten, and Oliver Goldsmith, who, with prophetic vision, wrote:

> "Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey
> Where wealth accumulates and men decay."

whose splendid statues now adorn the entrance to Trinity, are not thus honoured in vain. It may be new and interesting to many readers to know what is their title to be thus honoured. True they were Protestants, but they were Irish of the Irish.

W. J. Corbet, M.R.I.A.

THE CASE FOR THE IMMEDIATE ENFRANCHISEMENT OF THE WOMEN OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

SOME of us who have been working hard for forty years to secure for women the restitution of their ancient political rights, extended and adapted to meet modern conditions and uses, share to the full the indignation of those brave younger spirits who are resolved that this great act of human, national and social justice shall no longer be delayed in the interests of political parties, or to suit the personal convenience of party leaders.

We demand our immediate enfranchisement on the same terms as men:

(1) Because we have, by long and painful experience, proved the absolute impossibility of securing any further redress of the many legal wrongs from which we still suffer, and because we fully realise the great danger of further careless, mischievous, and unjust legislation, gravely imperilling the well-being of women.

(2) Because the equal citizenship of women is essential to the growth and development in men of the sense of social and political justice.

(3) Because the enfranchisement of the women of Great Britain and Ireland will hasten the enfranchisement of the women of all civilised nations, and will thus lead to the development of a higher social and political morality all the world over.

It may be convenient before considering in detail these three great issues, to give a brief summary of the salient facts of the woman movement in this country up to date, including therewith the restitution and extension of the local electoral rights of women, and their right to sit on local admistrative bodies, and the efforts—some successful and many fruitless—to change some others of the exclusively man-made laws from whose injustice women have suffered or still suffer.

It should, however, be here stated that the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies strictly limits its action to the acquisition of the Parliamentary franchise, and does not affiliate local societies having any further object. Many of the most ardent and vigorous supporters of Women's Suffrage are consequently in no way associated

with the National Union, but are to be found in many independent bodies working also for other issues, such as the Women's Co-operative Guild, the Women's Liberal Federation, and more particularly in the Women's Social and Political Union, an active offshoot of the Independent Labour Party. It is to the activity of this body and to that of the Lancashire and Cheshire Women Textile Workers Committee and of the Women's Co-operative Guild, more than to any or all others, that the present living force of this question is especially due.

In explanation of the phrase "restitution of their ancient political rights" it should be remembered that in the earlier periods of English life women had unquestionably possessed and exercised electoral rights as "suitors" in the County Courts, and as "burgesses" in various boroughs. The advancement of boroughs to the *status* of Parliamentary boroughs was in those early days largely a matter of royal caprice or interest, but wherever this *status* had been achieved the women burgesses had the same Parliamentary electoral rights as the men. In those days, however, these rights were frequently regarded as burdens, because the constituents were bound to pay the Parliamentary wages of the representatives, and in the case of county constituencies, the giving of the vote usually involved long and troublesome journeys on the part of the "suitors," men and women, who were the electors. In this *limited* sense, the plea of Lord Salvesen, in the case of the Scottish Women Graduates, was correct, the exemption of women from voting duties, which were not then valued as "rights," began as a sex privilege. The note at the end of this article gives some interesting facts as to the very ancient voting rights of women in Scottish burghs. The cases there referred to were of infinite service to women in England and Wales during the brief, sharp, and happily successful struggle in 1869 for the restitution of the municipal vote.

For the story of the first statutory exclusion of women from voting rights by the Reform Act of 1832, up to which time there had been no statutory discrimination of sex against women, I would refer every reader to Mr. Keir Hardie's admirable pamphlet *The Citizenship of Women*, to which this article is little more than a supplement. This statutory exclusion of women from Parliamentary voting rights was followed by the Municipal Corporations Act of 1835, which resulted in the exclusion of women from the exercise of the municipal franchise in England and Wales. Both these measures enlarged the voting rights of men, whilst they extinguished for the time those of women, for whom freedom has not "broadened down from precedent to precedent," but far otherwise. Happily the exertions of but a few persons, of whom the present writer had the privilege of being one, were successful in 1869 in securing the restitution of the municipal vote to women, who moreover during

this period of exclusion from the municipal vote, were still voting as ratepayers, equally with men (and this whether married or single) in districts not subject to the Municipal Corporations Act, and in matters not within the jurisdiction of the Town Council, such as the election of churchwardens, waywardens, Poor Law guardians, and for the appointment of overseers and sale of parish property.

The case of *Regina v. Harrald*, heard in the Court of Queen's Bench in January, 1871, decided that a married woman, though qualified by occupancy and by payment of rates, and put on the burgess list, cannot vote at the election of town councillors; and further, that a woman, who is rightly on the burgess list, but married before the election, is also disqualified from voting. In favour of the married woman it was argued by Mr. Charles Crompton that women are capable of voting, and do vote, that no exceptions were made by statute with regard to married women; and that "coverture" being no longer a bar to the holding of property, should, therefore, be no bar to the enjoyment of the incidents of property, such as voting. On the other hand it was argued by Mr. (Lord) Herschell that a married woman is not a person in the eyes of the law. She is not *sui juris*. Curiously enough the words of the Lord Chief Justice (Sir A. Cockburn), in giving judgment, show plainly that it is possible, in the discharge of the highest judicial functions, to determine questions affecting the civil rights of women, and yet be painfully ignorant of all matters relevant to the point to be decided upon. The Lord Chief Justice was obviously quite unconscious that women had possessed voting rights from time immemorial, and spoke of the Act of 1869 as though it were the first concession of them, instead of being merely the restitution of such of them as had been taken away thirty-four years before. It scarcely seems fitting that questions so gravely affecting the interests of women—present and future—should be thus lightly determined upon by persons ignorant of so many of the relevant facts.

This decision was given *after* the passing of the Married Women's Property Act of 1870 which enabled a wife to own and hold her own earnings, and thus to enjoy some at least of the benefits of property. Since then the Married Women's Property Act of 1882 has given to all married women fuller rights of property and contract, and with regard to women married since then has virtually abolished "coverture" with regard to property. Nevertheless, the ruling of *Regina v. Harrald* is still followed, and married women, however qualified as ratepayers, are in England and Wales still (1906) treated as not being persons in the eye of the law for the purpose of voting at county or Municipal elections.

The Local Government (England and Wales) Act of 1894 only enables married women to vote as parochial electors, for guardians and urban or rural district councillors or for parish councillors, and

this in spite of the pledge given by Sir Henry Fowler, who was in charge of the Bill, that he would secure their full enfranchisement for all local government purposes. Moreover, this Act and the subsequent Acts for Ireland and Scotland, provided that husband and wife shall not be electors in respect of the same property, a limitation which is not introduced in regard to any other relationship, and which is a survival of the legal doctrine that a married woman is not a "person" in the eyes of the law. With this exception the subsequent Local Government Acts for Scotland and Ireland secured to Scottish and Irish wives the full right of voting on precisely the same qualifications as men, including the owner, lodger and service franchises, which seem moreover to be far more liberally interpreted and understood than in England,—whilst in England and Wales (outside London) wives are still in the farcical hybrid position of being "persons" for the purposes of the minor elections, but not for borough or county council election purposes. Throughout the County of London they approach more nearly to the dignity of Irish and Scottish wives, thanks to the Act to assimilate the county and borough council franchises in London, passed in 1900.

The net result of all this tinkering legislation is that, for all *local administrative purposes*, women in Ireland and Scotland, whether married or unmarried, vote on precisely the same terms as men, but throughout England and Wales women do not possess the owner, lodger, or service franchises, whilst married women may not vote for borough or county councils, unless they are fortunate enough to live within the county of London, where they are empowered to vote for the county council and the borough councils.

With regard to the eligibility of women to public offices and to membership of local administrative bodies, it would appear to the plainest common-sense that in a country which since the Norman Conquest has been ruled by five Queens Regnant, the exclusion of a woman from public office on the sole ground of her sex, no matter how great her fitness for its duties, is an absurd barbarism. When the Education Act of 1870 became law, so little did those responsible for it share this modern view of women's disability, that both Mr. Gladstone and Mr. W. E. Forster, assuming that women were eligible, personally advocated the election of women as members of the "School Boards" created by it, although not one word appears in the Act defining the qualifications of candidates for office under it. At the first elections women were returned, not only in London, but in various parts of England, and in some instances headed the poll. One result of the return of women to the School Boards was that women were thereby encouraged to offer themselves for election as poor law Guardians, no sex qualification or disqualification being embodied in the legislation

which created Boards of Guardians. The first woman guardian was returned in 1875, and the first married woman guardian in 1881.

In 1888 came the Act establishing county councils for England and Wales, and as that Act neither expressed nor implied any sex disability for the office of councillor, at the first election under the Act Miss Cobden and Lady Sandhurst were returned as councillors to the London County Council, while Miss Cons was elected alderman by the council itself. Hereupon Mr. Beresford-Hope, whom Lady Sandhurst had defeated at the poll, brought the question before the Law Courts, and the Court of Appeal decided that women were not eligible as county councillors. On this occasion it was that the late Lord Esher, then Master of the Rolls, gave utterance to the astounding dictum, "I take it that neither by the Common Law nor by the Constitution of this country, from the beginning of the Common Law until now, can a woman be entitled to exercise any public function." Yet at the very time Lord Esher spoke, women were acting as overseers, waywardens, churchwardens, poor law guardians, and members of school boards, which can scarcely be considered private functions, to say nothing of the fact that he himself exercised his judicial office by virtue of the authority of a female sovereign! Moreover, both then and on more recent occasions, it seems to have been quite forgotten that 13 Vict. cap. 21, sec. 4 expressly enacts "That in all Acts words importing the masculine gender shall be deemed and taken to include females, unless the contrary is expressly provided." Yet in all recent legislation on this subject, Parliament has not merely disregarded this provision, but also the old and sound constitutional view (practically illustrated by the numerous offices held by women through centuries, and more recently by their membership of school boards and board of guardians), that disability is not to be presumed, but only admitted when declared and expressed. The Appeal Judges substituted for this the notion, historically indefensible, that "No woman is entitled to exercise any public function unless it is expressly in set terms granted," and thus enormously enlarged the scope of sex disability. The final judgment of the Court of Appeal, given on April 16, 1889, declared women incompetent to sit on county councils. Four days later the House of Lords rejected the Bill qualifying women to sit as county councillors by 108 votes to 23. Five weeks afterwards, in the early days of July, the Scottish Local Government Bill, creating county councils for Scotland, passed through committee. Section 9 of the Bill (now Act) opens by declaring that "No woman shall be eligible for election as a county councillor," a direct consequence of this legal decision. It is by means of this clause in the Scottish Act that women were shut out from being county councillors in Ireland.

The fourth schedule of the Irish Act provides that the section, of which this is one provision of the Local Government (Scotland) Act of 1889 shall apply to Ireland.

As a further result of this changed view of constitutional law it was held necessary, when the Local Government (England and Wales) Act of 1894 was before Parliament, to safeguard the eligibility of women as parish councillors, urban and rural district councillors, Poor Law guardians, and as members of the London Vestries, by enacting, in *each separate case specified*, that "No person shall be disqualified by sex or marriage for being a parish councillor," &c., a strange and lumbering mode of removing specific alleged disabilities, *whilst strengthening the false assumption on which alone the alleged disability rested.*

One special new disability was imposed upon women by this Act, in spite of the protests of Sir John Gorst and other friends of justice, when, on New Year's Day, 1894, Clause 22 of the Bill was under consideration. The Bill provided that the Chairman of a District Council, "unless personally disqualified by any Act, shall be, by virtue of his office, a justice of the peace for the county in which the district is situate." On this occasion Sir Henry Fowler proposed to introduce the limiting words, "unless a woman," thus taking the opportunity of an enfranchising measure to impose a fresh legal disability upon women. It should be remembered that up to this time no legal decision had been given, and no statute had been passed restraining women from the exercise of judicial functions. It is on record that in the reign of Mary Tudor two women were appointed justices of the peace, and there would seem no reason to question the legal powers of the Lord Chancellor, or of the Chancellor of the Duchy at the present time (save for the presumption suggested by this restrictive provision of the Local Government Act), to appoint suitable women to act as justices of the peace. That women magistrates, as well as women jurors, are urgently needed to secure effective justice in many cases, especially in cases affecting the relations of the sexes, is becoming daily more and more manifest.

A similar disqualification was introduced into the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894, and the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898.

The London Government Act of 1899, which transformed the old London Vestries into Metropolitan Borough Councils, withdrew from women the power to continue on the new councils the admirable work which some of them had been doing on the vestries since 1894. Whilst the Bill was before the House of Commons repeated divisions were taken on the question of the eligibility of women as councillors, aldermen, and mayors, with the final result that they were disqualified as mayors, but made eligible as coun-

cillors and aldermen in the Bill as it left the House of Commons. The House of Lords, however, on June 26, 1899, struck out the provision securing the eligibility of women as councillors and aldermen by a vote of 182 to 68. The majority against women was mainly composed of Peers who had come to the House, to whose business they scarcely ever pay any attention, for the express purpose of striking a blow at justice to women. How absolutely this was the case may be seen from the fact that, an hour after this division, a further division was taken on another point of the Bill in which only eighty Peers were present to take part. On July 6 the House of Commons, in obedience to the Government whip, accepted the Lords' amendment, and rejected altogether the claims of women to any place on the proposed new councils. The vote on Mr. Courtney's amendment, which reaffirmed the eligibility of women as councillors was—for, 177; against, 246; majority, 69. The second vote, formally accepting the Lords' amendment was—for, 243; against, 174; a majority against women again of 69. So far the efforts of women to amend this wrong have been in vain.

The proceedings in connection with the Education Acts for England and Wales and for London are too fresh in the memory of all to need recapitulation here. Only by the strenuous efforts of the few friends of justice to the mother-half of the race was any place reserved for women in the work which, as popularly elected members of the School Boards which those Acts extinguished, they had done so well; and that place only the inferior one of *co-opted* membership of the subordinate "Education Committee," no woman at present being eligible to either municipal or county councils, which are the "Education Authorities" and co-opting bodies. A woman, however, as a member of an urban district council whose area includes a population of over 20,000, may be even now a member of an "Education Authority." As there are over sixty such urban districts in England and Wales with populations of over 20,000, it would be wise for women practised in educational work to seek election to these councils.

Urban districts of that population, however, are apt for many reasons to seek transformation into municipal boroughs, to the councils of which women are not yet eligible.

The manner in which the "Education Authorities" have used their power of co-opting women as members of "Education Committees" is sufficient proof, if any were needed, that masculine sex-bias, free and uncontrolled, does not intend to permit to the mother-half of the race any real share of influence in the education of their own children. In the overwhelming proportion of instances, two women only have been co-opted to education committees, including from twenty to sixty or even seventy men.

The Women's Suffrage agitation in this country practically began with the return of Mr. John Stuart Mill to Parliament in 1865. It is, I believe, true that a petition from women of Yorkshire, asking for the enfranchisement of their sex, was presented to the House of Commons whilst the Reform Act of 1832 was under consideration. Mrs. Mill's most admirable article, "Enfranchisement of Women," appeared in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW of July 1851, whilst Justitia's[1] powerful pamphlet, *Women and the Electoral Franchise* was published in 1855. But no sustained agitation was then begun. When the return of Mr. Mill as M.P. for Westminster assured women of an absolutely trustworthy advocate of their claims in the House of Commons, the active agitation began with the preparation of a Women's suffrage petition, which, signed by 1,499 women, was presented by Mr. Mill in May, 1866. In 1867 the Representation of the People Bill was before Parliament, to which Mr. Mill put down an amendment that instead of the word "man" the word "person" should be used with regard to the suffrage under the Act. This amendment was defeated, 81 voting for and 202 against it. But a further amendment substituting the words "male persons" was also rejected. The Suffrage Societies, which had come into being as a result of Mr. Mill's return to Parliament, resolved to claim the suffrage under the new Act. Women occupiers in Manchester to the number of 5,347, and in Salford about 1,500, sent in their claims, as well as large numbers in other places, and many women freeholders in the counties. Most of the revising barristers threw the names out. The Manchester women consolidated their claims, and appealed against the decision, in the case *Chorlton v. Lings*, which was heard in the Court of Common Pleas November 7 and 10, 1867, before Lord Chief Justice Bovill and Justices Willes, Keating and Byles. Lord Chief Bovill conceded :—

"It is quite true that a few instances have been brought before us where in ancient times, in the reigns of Henry IV., Henry V., and Edward VI., women appear to have been parties to the return of members to Parliament, and possibly other instances may be found in early times, not only of women having voted, but also of their having assisted in the deliberations of the legislature. Indeed, it is mentioned by Selden in his *England's Epinomis*, c. 2, sec. 19, that they did so."

He then proceeded to argue that the non-user of the right for so long a period raised a strong presumption against its having legally existed, that the Legislature in '67 used the word "man" in order to designate expressly the male sex, as distinct from women,—and that therefore Lord Brougham's Act (13-14 Vic., c. 21, s. 4) did not apply. The other judges concurred. The second case, *Chorlton v. Kessler*, that of a woman householder at

[1] Justitia is still living and hoping for justice to women.

Rusholme with a county qualification, and two other cases, raising different points, the judges refused to hear, and treated them as decided by the first case.

In 1870 Mr. Jacob Bright brought in his "Women's Electoral Disabilities Removal Bill," in the following terms[1]:

"That in all Acts relating to the qualification and registration of voters or persons entitled to or claiming to be registered and to vote in the election of members of Parliament, wherever words occur which import the male gender, the same shall be held to include women for all purposes connected with and having reference to the right to be registered as voters, and to vote in such election, any law or usage to the contrary notwithstanding."

The Second Reading was carried on May 4 by a majority of 33. Had this Bill been permitted to become law, a long and weary struggle would have been saved, each successive enfranchisement of men would have carried women along with it, and that higher civilisation and human justice for which Mr. Mill hoped so much from the enfranchisement of women would have been appreciably nearer to-day. Unfortunately Mr. Gladstone, then Prime Minister, took a decided stand against the enfranchisement of women, which he opposed to the last, and in response to a Government "whip," the motion for going into Committee on May 12 was defeated by a majority of 126. During the 27 years between 1870 and 1897 twelve divisions were taken on the Women's Suffrage question with varying adverse fortunes, and on February 18, 1886, the Second Reading of a Women's Suffrage Bill was carried *without* a division. The dissolution of that year stopped its further progress. In 1892 the Second Reading of Sir Albert Rollit's Bill was *defeated* by a majority of 23, the last adverse majority.

On February 3, 1897, Mr. Faithful Begg's Bill was carried by a majority of 71, but seven years were suffered to pass without a debate and division, so that it came almost as a surprise when, on March 16, 1904, Sir Charles M'Laren's Women's Suffrage Resolution was carried by a majority of 114.

Whilst women have been working and patiently "waiting" for their enfranchisement, some ameliorative measures as to other wrongs which they suffered have been passed into law, notably the Married Women's Property Acts of 1870 and 1882, applying to England, Wales and Ireland, the cognate Acts of 1877 and 1881

1 It is well to note that the Bill introduced by Mr. Jacob Bright thirty-six years ago, is identical in terms with the measure introduced by Mr. Will Crookes on the last day of the Session of 1904. It was drafted by Dr. Pankhurst, in 1870, for the Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage, and introduced by Mr. Jacob Bright at their request. Dr. Pankhurst was also counsel, along with Mr. (Lord) Coleridge, in the case *Chorlton* v. *Lings*, and was a member of the first Women's Suffrage Committee formed in Manchester, and an earnest supporter of the cause to the day of his death. It is fitting that his wife and children should be the leaders of the advanced section of Woman Suffragists, who have made the enfranchisement of women a living question demanding immediate attention.

applying to Scotland, and the Infants' Act of 1886, giving to the married mothers of the three kingdoms some slight share of claim to the custody and control of their own children. But here the reforming zeal of Parliament seems to have stopped, and for a very simple reason. The exclusively male electorate has, during the period of our working for Women's Suffrage, increased from seven hundred thousand to over seven millions. A male Parliament, elected by male electors only, is far too preoccupied with its own affairs, and the affairs of those to whom it is forced to admit some responsibility, to trouble itself about the well-being of those who are mere "Outlanders" in their native country. I write with deep feeling and no inconsiderable bitterness when I think of the hopelessly futile efforts I have myself made to secure the amendment of the iniquitous English Law of Divorce, the shameless law of intestacy, the miserable inadequacy of the law to secure to married women a just share of their husband's earnings for the support of the family, the outrageous English law of marriage, as expounded by thirteen judges in 1889, and many another legal iniquity, to explain which adequately would need an article far longer than the present one may be. I have come now to the conclusion that nothing more will be won for womanhood and justice in these islands until women are, equally with men, "makers of Parliament." The Parliamentary Franchise is our most sorely needed charter of liberty, our key of opportunity, and our weapon of defence against further reckless and unjust legislation. Should the present holders of office remain at the Home Office and the Local Government Board, we may expect the practical exclusion by law of married women from paid industry, whilst from other quarters we may expect a strenuous effort to secure the legal enactment of a "minimum wage," carefully differentiated so as to secure to a man, whether married or single, a wage adequate to the maintenance of himself, a wife and three children, whilst a woman is only to receive such a wage as is adequate to the maintenance of a single independent adult. *Fabian Tract*, No. 128, *The Case for a Legal Minimum Wage* affirms:

"Whilst the present competitive system of employment by competing private enterprises prevails, the industrial minimum wage must conform to three conditions: (*a*) *It must be lower for women than for men;* (*b*) all men must have the same minimum wage, and all women the same minimum wage; (*c*) the man's wage must be enough to support a family, and the woman's to support a single independent adult.

"This leaves the problem of the bachelor and the widow with children unsolved, just as they are left unsolved by our present system.

"The case of the bachelor may be disregarded for two reasons: (*a*) If the minimum wage secures enough to the married man, it is no evil, but only a *negligible inequity*, to let the bachelor have a little more than enough; (*b*) the practice of working-men at present shows that, as a matter of fact, they do not find that they can provide themselves with

domestic service and companionship more cheaply as bachelors than by marriage."

The case of a widow with a family they propose to provide for by "sufficient assistance from public funds to enable her, with the aid of free public schools, and free meals in them, to make up her income to the standard for heads of families." They quite overlook, when they talk of the single man's enormous excess of wage over that of any woman, the universal effect of thus teaching him, in the most forcible way possible, that he is a far more valuable human being than a woman can possibly be—with the conceit and self-indulgence to which such preferential treatment is sure to lead—nor do they suggest any means whereby the privileged male shall, when married, be induced, or compelled to devote an adequate portion of his wages to the support of wife and family. They do not suggest that the woman's wage shall be such as to enable her to provide against sickness, old age, or lack of employment, nor do they take into account the fact that many unmarried women wage-earners have others to provide for, an aged father or mother, or younger sisters and brothers, &c. It is simply monstrous that it should be possible for male lawmakers and administrators to deal with questions such as these without the equal co-operation and control of women. The man alone all but invariably sees only the half-truth which suits his sedulously educated masculine belief in his own sex as the whole of humanity. It is this unhappy mental condition, the result of ages of masculine domination, which makes the full recognition of the equal citizenship of women essential to the development and growth in men of the sense of social and political justice Democracy, in the sense of equal justice to each and all, has not failed, because it has not yet been tried, the dominance of a *sex aristocracy* still prevailing, with the honourable exception of a few small communities, even in those states and nations which boast most loudly of their democratic institutions. The enfranchisement of women would substitute realities for shams, and educate humanity up to the perception of the higher human justice. The woman's movement is now in the fullest sense an international one, and whatever is won for women in these islands would therefore speedily be achieved for the women of all civilised nations, and would of necessity lead to the speedy development all the world over of a higher social and political morality. And such a higher social and political morality is vital to the well-being of the race, and essential to its upward and onward progress.

The urgency of the case being so clear, what stands in the way of the immediate enfranchisement of the women of Great Britain and Ireland? Simply the selfish hostility of some members of the present Cabinet, the temporary convenience of others, and the faithless feebleness of the 283 Liberal members of the present

House of Commons who are pledged to Women's Suffrage, Had these 283 M.P.'s been loyal to their pledges, it is absolutely impossible that no place should have been found last Session for the consideration of a Women's Suffrage Bill, and only a second place at an evening sitting for the discussion of a Women's Suffrage Resolution. The Prime Minister's words to the Women's Suffrage deputation simply proved that, whilst admitting frankly the absolute justice of our demand, it would be very convenient to him not to have the question raised as one to be immediately dealt with by his Administration. And in this matter Liberal M.P.'s, and the Liberal rank and file outside, have shown themselves, as they had previously repeatedly done, ready to sacrifice the woman's cause to the temporary convenience or wish of their party leaders. The National Liberal Federation last year, at the meeting of its General Committee, and again at the meeting of its General Council, passed a Women's Suffrage Resolution by a very large majority. This year, the Liberals being in power, neither Committee nor Council has dealt with the matter. Did the resolutions of last year mean anything at all, or were they merely intended to assure the help of women at the General Election? At any rate, no action for the woman's cause has resulted from them.

The present Cabinet contains three Ministers, Mr. Asquith, Mr. Bryce, and Lord Crewe, who are determinedly opposed to this act of justice towards women. It contains also two others who advocate immediate "manhood" suffrage, and are opposed to the enfranchisement of women, Lord Loreburn and Mr. John Sinclair; whilst Mr. Thomas Shaw, the Lord Advocate, who though not a member of the Cabinet is, from his office, a powerful influence in the Ministry, though he has voted for Women's Suffrage, is now committed also to "manhood" suffrage. Our immediate and most grave danger lies in the possibility of the effective postponement of our question till the high wall of "manhood" suffrage, mere and sheer sex ascendancy and aristocracy, has been built up against us, a wall which it might easily cost the women of the nation all the toilsome effort of another quarter of a century to pull down. This danger lies immediately before us, and our "adult" suffrage friends refuse to see it. They urge that no woman should be enfranchised until all men are at the same time enfranchised. We, who are also adult suffragists, know the danger to be real and imminent, and, therefore, we demand in the first instance, and *at once*, the abolition of the *sex disqualification*. The rest will follow quickly. Every man, it should be remembered, is a *potential voter*, which no woman can be till the sex disqualification is removed, and, therefore, the two positions of the voteless man and the voteless woman are not comparable. The present Ministry has no intention of granting "adult" suffrage," in the true sense of the words. Their conduct with regard to the Transvaal Constitution

has plainly shown this, even had we not known it before, whilst the childish giggling which greeted Mr. Winston Churchill's allusions to Women's Suffrage in the debate on the Transvaal Constitution is conclusive as to the incompetence of the House of Commons to realise the real gravity and human value of the issues at stake. We realise them to the full, and it is this keen realisation which justifies and necessitates the more vigorous action which has been taken by the Women's Social and Political Union, the Lancashire and Cheshire Women Textile Workers' Committee, and other earnest Women's Suffragists. We demand the removal of this shameful sex disqualification, and our enfranchisement on the same terms as men, *during this coming autumn Session*, either by the insertion of the needful provisions in the Plural Voting Bill, or in some other manner. We decline to accept evasive excuses for perverse delay. What has to be done must be done now, and we appeal for the immediate help of all women of heart and honour, and of all just-minded men. Our course is clear and defined. We will that our sisters shall be politically free to work out their own economic and social salvation, and that of the race.

When the fathers and founders of the American Republic realised the greatness of the task before them, and of all its issues, they took a solemn pledge of constancy; and we who realise the still greater issues of the task we have undertaken to our countrywomen, to the women of all lands, and to humanity, present and future, follow their noble example, and pledge to the accomplishment of our work "our lives, our fortunes, and our most sacred honour."

Even now we are not alone, and soon multitudes will follow and work with us, for

> "Our echoes roll from soul to soul,
> And grow for ever and for ever."

IGNOTA.

NOTE.—"*Admission of a Woman as a Burgess.*—On Tuesday (May 18, 1869), at the Edinburgh Town Council, an application of a woman to have her husband admitted a burgess was reported upon by the Lord Provost's Committee, who expressed the opinion that the husband had no claim to be admitted a burgess, but that in respect the applicant complied with all the old conditions of burgess-ship, *i.e.*, 'held stob and staik' in the burgh, and 'walked, warded, paid extents and skatts therein conform to their substance,' she should be admitted a burgess in her own right. On this subject Mr. Marwick communicated some curious information as to the old custom of the Scotch burghs to admit women burgesses and women sisters of guild. On March 17, 1406, Alison de Duscoull was made sister of the Edinburgh guild as heir of the late Robert Duscoull, her brother. The oldest Peebles burgh record contains some entries showing it to have been the practice in that burgh to have women burgesses, thus: 'On November 15, 1456, was mayed burgess Ely Scot, and sal pay for hir freedom, x s.' On October 29, 1459, 'That ilk day was mayd burges Meg Woodhal, and sal mak for hir fredom a ruid of caussa.' On April 23, 1464, 'item, that ilk day was gewn the freedom to Peronale, and sche

sall pay thairfor xxx s. but favour.' In Edinburgh again, an ordinance dated March 14, 1507, specifying the entry money to be charged on the admission of various descriptions of burgesses, contains the following sentence: 'And siclike the burges dochteris, lauchfullie gottin, to have the priuelege of the second son z for the burgesry, xiij s. iiij d., and for the gildry, xx s.' These extracts showed that in the old Scottish burghs women were admitted to the privileges of burgess-ship and guild sister-ship; and that what was now proposed was no innovation upon the old constitutional principle, under which women's rights were secured at a very early period of our history. The magistrates and council unanimously resolved that in special cases women might still be admitted to the rights of burgess-ship, when they comply with the ancient conditions."[1]

---

[1] Reprinted from the *Manchester Examiner and Times*, May 22, 1869.

WOMAN AND WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE

'Tis said that if man be scratched the savage will appear, but as compensation we can all agree that if you get through woman's superficialities you will find the saint.

That is, man and woman stand for the two elementary forces at work in the development and evolution of our national life, and mankind generally. These forces are known by many names, such as for instance, might and right, the real and the ideal, the selfish and the unselfish. Man alone may be expected to secure from a merely physical and individualistic standpoint the survival of the FIT, but if woman is taken into partnership in the management of our everyday world, all that she stands for, namely, purity, sweetness, and gentleness, will ensure, in our upward struggle, the survival of the BEST.

It is for this reason that all of us who believe in woman's purifying, sympathetic and considerate mission, and who have the best and permanent interests of our nation at heart, should strenuously support Female Suffrage now that it has become a practical question. At any rate, as the matter has ceased to be merely academical, mere man will have to make up his mind as to whether he will support or oppose it, always provided there really is a considerable proportion of the community convinced that the reading by a woman of a pamphlet on Education, Sanitation, or the Housing Question, or her occasional attendance at a political meeting, or her right to still more occasionally cast a vote, will either wreck the home-life of the nation, prevent woman from giving birth to healthy children, or cause her to cease to be the helpmate and the inspiration of man. If there is such a large number of men holding such views, is it too ridiculous to suggest that as a matter of fact the very opposite is more likely, and indeed, has been the natural result of giving woman a vote?

It goes without saying that any new revolutionary departure requires to be approached in a spirit of cautiousness, but has the time not arrived when we should look this question squarely in the face? and if it will stand a cold, calm and critical inspection, then, should we not accept the conclusion arrived at, even if unpalatable? There is certainly no need, and no excuse for the extravagant utterances which have recently been made on both sides.

Before considering the subject, and particularly the chief argu-

ments which have been advanced against giving woman a vote, it may be as well to clear the ground somewhat and to examine the foundations upon which man has built up his assumed lordly and masterful superiority in all things apparently equally open to man and woman. Perhaps the answers to the following questions may help us to determine if there is *prima facie* a case or the requisite authority in favour of man allocating to himself the sole management of mundane affairs.

Is he, for instance, so far as numbers, so vastly in the majority? Is his brain so peculiarly and wonderfully made that he alone has all, or even the chief part of, the wisdom of the human race? Is the history of the world silent so far as women are concerned, only being able to chronicle the prowess and achievements of men? Has man in the course of evolution alone entitled himself to be regarded as the true custodian of the children (all the future men and women of the next generation), the sick and the bereaved, (the whole human race at some time or other), or the aged (the end of all of us who live)? Has man, as compared with woman, proved himself so temperate in any direction as to demonstrate his vast superiority?

Has man, either in his treatment of himself or in his conduct of affairs generally, proved himself incomparably, or even exceptionally blessed in uncommon common-sense? Has man alone entitled himself to the respect of the race by reason of his mastery over his lower self, and is it through woman's lack of continence that the demi-monde exists? Is it the ideal created in a child's mind by the father that usually acts as the spur to nobler effort in after life? Is it man or is it woman that has kept the reverence for a Supreme Being amongst us and implanted in each rising generation the sense of a moral ideal? Is it woman's inferiority that when man brings her out to a mining camp or other pioneer settlement as his wife, or mother, or sister, all kinds of beastliness have to hide their faces that were hitherto unashamed? Is physical courage and the natural capacity for muscular developments in the arms and chest rather than moral courage and the natural capacity for muscular development in the thighs and pelvis the sole authority for the right to govern? Is moral courage the least of all the gifts, so that as it is woman's chief weapon of defence, is it also her chief disqualification to be consulted? Does man to such a paramount extent possess the intuitive instinct for all that is pure and noble, refined, beautiful and artistic, with the result that woman is a negligible quantity in such matters? Finally, is it a fact that, of the many subjects dealt with by parochial, municipal, and parliamentary bodies, such as education, the housing of the poor, the management of public lodging houses and lunatic asylums, the supervision of the employment of children, the overlooking of industrial schools containing

children from three years of age, the supervision of midwives, of baby farms, of homes for inebriate women, of police courts and their waiting rooms, the administration of the Factory Acts, in fact, everything affecting women and children under the divisions of work, health, housing, sanitation, education, drink and crime, can be so much better handled and settled by the mere man, that it would be waste of time to confer with woman on such matters? Or is it possible that Nature is unconsciously producing, through necessity, a new variety, the twin-sexed or unsexed parliamentary candidate?

If the answer is an emphatic "Yea," to all the questions enumerated above, then there is nothing more to be said, and woman's foolishness only equals her presumption in asking to share with man the running of this world. On the other hand, if to not a single question the answer can be a simple affirmative, then perhaps we had better probe the matter further and consider the chief arguments against Woman's Suffrage, as the matter may be of so much importance for us all that we ought to come to a definite conclusion, and to become either propagandists or active opponents. Indifference on a vital subject is a sign of mental cowardice or incompetence.

Perhaps one of the most forcible, because subtle attacks on woman's claim which has been made is Mr. Punch's remarks in his Epilogue to his 130th volume. Let us partially but adequately quote him:

"Yes," replied Mr. Punch, "I do. You and your sisters have, at last, convinced me."

"Hooray!" cried the lady triumphantly, and she waved her flag. "I knew, if we held out long enough, we should convince somebody. Now, tell me, what was it particularly that showed you our cause was right? Was it the way we attacked Asquith—was it our display in the House of Commons—was it ——"

"Yes," said Mr. Punch, "it was all that."

"There! Why, if it hadn't been for us no one would ever have heard of Woman' Suffrage."

"No," said Mr. Punch; "and if it had not been for you I should never have believed in it. Until you began your—your demonstrations I was opposed to it. Logically, I admit, it seemed all right. So far as intellect went you were superior to many of us. Yet, somehow, politics and women—I did not like to consider them together. An election is an unpleasant business, a rowdy business; and I do not care to see women in a rough-and-tumble. A woman," continued the romantic Mr. Punch, "should never be in a hurry, should never be in a ridiculous situation, should never have to raise her voice. A woman should always be cool and composed. Politics is neither a cooling nor a composing game.

"Then, again, I have noticed that the electors of one side find it necessary to break up the meetings of the other side. At times it is their duty to call one of the speakers a liar. The elector must celebrate his victory by stoning the defeated. To be, in fact, the Complete Elector, one has to forget a good many things. An election," concluded the Sage, "brings out the very worst of a man; and it is inexcusable for a woman ever to be anything but her best."

"But," said the lady, "I thought you were with us?"

"Those," said Mr. Punch. "were my views until a short time ago. Now I see differently. I remember an exhibition in the Ladies' Gallery. I have heard of a woman and a dog-whip at a meeting of Mr. Asquith's. I cannot forget—I do not think any one will ever forget—an insult that one of your sisters paid Sir Edward Grey. And, as I think on these things, I realise suddenly what it all means. It means that you have at last descended to our level; that you have put off your dignity and your womanliness, and are become indeed, the Complete Elector. So, Madam, when you get the franchise, as you will eventually, I shall say to myself——" Mr. Punch hesitated.

"Yes?" said she. "Go on."

"With apologies, Madam—'Serve 'em right.'"

In spite of the respect due to Mr. Punch's old age, I submit that his superficially plausible argument against is one of the strongest arguments for woman being taken into partnership. If man lacks reasoning power to such an extent that he cannot carry out one of the most responsible of his privileges—that is, to elect the men who will decide his nation's destiny—without rowdyism, abuse, rough-and-tumbldom, and generally the exhibition of his brutishness, it is surely about time woman was called in to show him how to retain his self-respect, and to help him to use his mental rather than his physical powers in the performance of one of his highest duties.

Mr. Punch's many friends will be deeply grieved if his reasoning power is tottering, but his Epilogue certainly indicates such a condition of mind. If there is one thing that all of us can possibly agree upon, it is that woman's presence at any committee or public meeting invariably has a restraining or soothing effect on the heated passions of men in debate.

Another criticism, but of a nature far more profound, we find expressed in Marie Corelli's new book, *Treasure of Heaven*, wherein she makes her hero, Angus Reay, voice an oft-repeated objection, and one which the authoress evidently shares. On page 404 Reay is made to say:

"Women are doing a great deal of mischief just now. Look at them fussing about Female Suffrage. Female Suffrage quotha! Let them govern their homes properly, wisely, reasonably, and faithfully, and they will govern the nation!

"A woman who really loves a man," went on Angus, "governs him unconsciously to herself, by the twin powers of sex and instinct. She was intended for his helpmate, to guide him in the right way by her finer forces. If she neglects to cultivate those finer forces—if she tramples on her own natural heritage, and seeks to 'best' him with his own weapons—she fails—she must fail—she deserves to fail! But as true wife and true mother she is supreme," &c. &c.

This condemnation and expression of a very general opinion is perhaps the most difficult to answer, because it appeals to all the conservative, not to say prehistoric, instincts in man.

Marie Corelli, however, answers her own objections by deliberately making the millionaire David Helmsley, after exhaustive search,

leave his six or seven millions to the heroine, Mary Deane, one of the most charming, refined and noble, and yet practical, work-loving, and ministering women it has been my good fortune to meet, whether in the world of men or books—and I am grateful to say I have met a good many in both spheres. But, if Mary Deane is not only capable, but the most capable, person Marie Corelli can invent to honestly and equitably administer a huge estate in the best interests of all, Mary Deane is equally capable of assisting in administering a great Empire, or at least in having a voice in all that concerns women and children in such an Empire; and, if the latter contention is granted, what is the difference?

This objection, however, so earnestly expressed by Marie Corelli through her hero, must be more fully met and answered, because it is the generally accepted way of settling and dismissing this subject. On the surface such a criticism does carry conviction, and to the average man or woman appears unanswerable, because it asks for conditions to be left as they are by appealing to man's conservative instincts, and to the false sentiment of women's high mission as custodian of the home.

Like many other commonly accepted beliefs, however, partaking more of the nature of a fetish or of a thoughtless acceptation than anything else, they are found to be based on a state of things which has ceased to exist, with the result that the average habit of thought often contains a skeleton instead of a pulsating national need. This is certainly the case with Woman's Suffrage, and the objection to accepting woman as man's helpmate in other than purely so-called "home" matters. It was doubtless true for centuries, and in prehistoric times it may have been for ages, that both men and women of one family or tribe or race were regarded as the lawful prey of another family, or tribe or race, with the result that man's home and collection of homes were literally his castle, and the safest place to be found, and consequently, woman carrying in her care and person the responsibility of continuing the race, home was undoubtedly her proper and only place. Because, however, prehistoric man, when he went abroad, by reason of wild beasts and wild men, literally took his life in his hands, with the result that physical prowess and endurance, both in individuals and tribes, became the highest of all gifts (an echo of this has come down to our own day in the canting phrase, the so-called "nobleness of the soldier's calling," by which we describe the art of learning to murder with the least risk to ourselves), does not justify modern man, the quill and cab and engine driver, the shop assistant and bar tender, the navvy, bricklayer, and factory-hand, &c. &c., to say that "home" is woman's proper place. To do so is merely repeating the impress his brain-cells received many generations ago, when the needs of the case compelled his male ancestors to come to this conclusion.

Men, however, have ceased to fight for their food, their homes, and their lives, and women have ceased to be merely breeding machines and cooking utensils. In fact, is it too extravagant a notion to suggest that we have now arrived at that stage in the development of the human race when Dame Nature or the Spirit of Progressive Perfection, or whatever else one chooses to call that Ineffable Something which is at the Heart of the Purpose of Things, is at last able to make one more stride forward in a never ending endeavour to ensure the survival of the B E S T, and that this stride will be the opportunity which will shortly be given woman to express herself and to slowly bring into being as practical commonplaces in the life of the nation, the ideals always associated with her at her best?

If Woman's Suffrage is, as I believe, in the direction of the highest progress, and is going to help the eternal truth at the heart of all things to express itself, we may by our opposition retard and even deflect to another nation the inevitable march of events, but we shall be foolish to flatter ourselves by thinking we can prevent truth from expressing herself through one or other of the races of the world. Every one will, however, concur if we can only agree as to what is true and what is false progress, that all Britishers should do and sacrifice everything to keep Truth's path of least resistance within the British Empire itself.

Woman in the past, except for the silent and unrecognised influence she has been able to exert in the home, has been practically powerless to express herself, but the terrible growth of our social evils has, in the opinion of many, made it necessary that she should have a wider and more positive scope in the interests of humanity, justice and progress. In view of the social problems confronting us, and which we shall have to solve during the nex generation, or retire as a World-Power, it is certainly worth trying woman's co-operation, man having failed to cope with them alone. Unemployment, the breeding of the incompetent and the development of the inefficient, the increase in insanity and national deterioration in many directions, require the undivided attention of not only man, but of woman also, if we are going to ensure the growth of a healthy next generation. One thing we can be quite positive of and that is that as soon as woman realises she has the power, she will put an end to the abominable environment, and so go to the root of a large part of the trouble, under which tens of thousands of babies are born every year. She will further see that every woman, merely because she is a woman, and likely to become a mother, will be given the opportunity of bringing her child into the world under the minimum conditions required byhealth and decency, if only by reason of the need to give the little stranger a fair start in life, in the best interests of the nation without considering the

claims of humanity and sentiment. Man has proved his inability to manage single-handed the nation's internal affairs, by his disregard of the elementary necessities required to healthily rear his own offspring whether in the interests of his species, his work, or his country's future.

At the present time the average woman cares nothing about politics, whether municipal or national, social or imperial, for the simple reason that she is not supposed to, and no opportunity is given her to find out. Man, in his lordly superiority, leaves to her the huge responsibility of bringing up the next generation, and adjourns to the pub., or club, or other rendezvous to discuss his precious politics, and, more often than not, something else. Out of the hundreds of political discussions amongst men it has been my lot to be present at, or contribute to, they have not as a rule impressed me by their insight or intelligent grasp of the point at issue, in fact they have been chiefly remarkable for the importance given to the non-essential, and certainly do not justify man assuming unto himself, if not in speech yet in his practice and the conduct of affairs, the possession of all, or nearly all, the reasoning power. If, however, woman is given a vote, she will, as a rule, wish to know something about the questions, particularly the social questions, of the hour, and to their own improvement, for it is often one only begins to learn when one begins to teach, no one will be more delighted to instruct her than her husband, father, brother, or sweetheart. Thus would be forged in the national life a new hope and joy and tie which would weld and cement together the interests of all the adult members of a family in a way that nothing else has so far done, and this tie would remain for ever fresh and interesting because of its always changing aspect, and its close relationship to everything affecting the ordinary daily life of the individual. In fact, it seems impossible to imagine anything more capable of keeping sweet the nation's home-life than by man having to recognise woman's partnership and political equality, for only in this way will be removed permanently man's mental attitude of superiority towards women and all that it implies in every grade of society, but especially the lower one goes in the social scale. In fact, I do not hesitate to say that any Statesman who carries Woman's Suffrage will have taken the most far-sighted means of conserving the home life of the nation and of counteracting the disintegrating forces which appear to threaten its destruction.

Mrs. Pember Reeves of New Zealand, who probably did more than any one else to make Women's Suffrage possible in that Colony, states definitely from first-hand knowledge, that not a single one of the evil results predicted, resulted. There were no wrecked domestic hearths, the same party was returned, and the women voted very much as did their husbands and fathers, in fact, the

result had been exactly the opposite to that fore-boded. When women had no votes the men left home to talk politics, but now in an ever increasing extent they talked politics at home and shared with their wives their interest in public affairs. In fact, the franchise had proved of the greatest value to women in increasing their self-respect and their importance in the eyes of their menfolk, two of the most important factors in making the lives of women bearable and less monotonous.

Such a definite and positive statement by Mrs. Reeves is very valuable and worth all the pessimistic and doleful anticipations of conservative man.

When considering this matter we must not forget another aspect, and which alone practically makes Woman's Suffrage inevitable and a logical growth. That is the way in which woman has trespassed, and successfully trespassed, upon man's domain in the realms of business, manufactures, education, art, science, and politics. We have admitted woman, and the more willingly, the greater our experience of her, into our offices and our factories, and even our political organisations. In fact, at the present time, no part of man's life is regarded with the awe naturally due to mystery. Generations ago we found that woman was indispensable in connection with the social work of the churches, and during the past twenty years we have gradually come to the conclusion that we cannot conduct the business details of the nation without her assistance, although we would have her, if we could, as a meek and humble drudge or assistant, always to be grateful that she is even allowed to do the dirty or routine work without any rights. It is certainly a disgrace the hours and the conditions under which women have to work for a mere pittance in many offices at the present time. Of, however, still more importance from our standpoint and the subject of this article, we men have had to admit that we cannot win parliamentary or even municipal elections without our natural ally, woman, and yet a large number of us would try and throw dust in her eyes and deceive ourselves by uttering the specious and threadbare arguments used by Mr. Punch and Miss Corelli. If woman's place is only in the home, we should have resolutely kept her there, but, *nolens volens* we shall have to accept the inevitable and logical consequences of having helped or rather induced her to break the hearth-bonds, by offering her tempting positions in Offices, Factories, Board Schools, and Government Departments, and not even content with that we must forsooth play into her hands by so conducting and organising our political propaganda as to make her realise that she is one of the most important factors in any election. Let us accept the inevitable, for it is the inevitable, and desist from opposing the irresistible march of events, for we have only admitted woman to the outer

world because the right moment had arrived for doing so, and not because of any choice on the part of man. A natural and beneficial growth has been at work, compelling us, even against our judgment, and in the opinion of many of us our bettter judgment, to admit woman to man's kingdom, but instead of kicking against the pricks let us rejoice that we shall have her assistance and partnership in the world of affairs. In our prosperity during the past half-century, we men in our individualistic ideals and worship at the shrine of mammon, and the doctrine of the survival of the fittest, have forgotten our responsibilities to our weaker brethren, and woman will help us to mend some of the present results of our short-sighted and selfish methods.

If any additional reason were required to justify the recognition of woman as in very truth man's equal, and in moral courage his superior, it is only necessary to remember that when a man dies leaving a wife and family unprovided for (or, at the best, amongst the middle class very inadequately), neither the Government, nor municipalities, nor society at large, nor man generally, or in particular, feel in duty bound to keep that home intact, because of the sacredness of home life generally, or of woman's unfittedness or inability to compete with man. No, man under such circumstances recognises no inequality, but leaves the woman to bear her own burden and to fight her own hard struggle, and more often than not woman comes out victor in the apparently unequal contest,

Man's admission, that destitute women are at least his equals by neglecting to make any special provision for them, except the workhouse, will have to be extended, by giving woman, whether destitute or not, equal voting power with himself.

Woman has had to learn her lesson in a hard school, especially the majority of married women, and when the parliamentary vote is granted to her, as it will and must be ere long, she will not abuse it. Probably for a long time we men will be surprised at the little practical use she makes of her new opportunities, but gradually her influence will be felt, and the British Empire will become a sweeter, purer, and happier Empire for her "interference!"

FREDERICK THORESBY.

LUX MUNDI ANTIQUA ET NOVA.

ONE cannot but think that Dr. Goldwin Smith, in his book *In Quest of Light*, is no more likely to find it than did his illustrious predecessors Socrates, Aristotle, Plato, Des Cartes, Kant and Hegel.

The term philosophy implies a love of wisdom, but most of the ancient philosophers, and some of the moderns, limit the possibilities of the acquisition of wisdom by pursuing it in one direction only; and they sought, by excluding all knowledge of the physical or external world, to distinguish themselves in the discovery of truth by their reasoning faculties alone. They only looked at one side of the medal; and so, by ignoring the facts and achievements of science, their deductions, while being logically sound, are apt to be very far from sound scientifically. The physical universe was, and is, to many philosophers, a *terra incognita*, and it would seem that the "true" philosopher has generally deemed it beneath his dignity to explore it. He has heard of it, of course; and, therefore, knows of it; but it cannot be said that he is intimately acquainted with it. It is enough for him to believe that his philosophy is the only true, all-containing omnipotent source of knowledge.

One cannot but think that if this spirit of philosophic self-complacency had not dominated the world's great philosophers in the early and more recent times, the progress and elevation of the human race in all that constitutes our civilisation would have been much more exceedingly great. Such speculations of philosophers which have become crystallised into various cults have not always been productive of good, nor have they always tended to increase the sum of human happiness, because they were wanting in the essentials to a knowledge of natural laws, and of the chemico-physical sciences.

We see, in our mind, a person playing on a string instrument and producing therefrom sweet sounds of harmony; Socrates also saw him, and was inspired to seek to show by the lyre and its harmony that the soul exists, and that it is immortal. This was quite praiseworthy in itself, but how much better it would have been if Socrates had first sought to discover the nature of sound and how it was produced! It would seem that he did not look any further than the lyre and the player fingering it, yet there are other things necessary to sound. There is the atmosphere, composed of minute particles of matter which must be set in motion by the vibration of the wires of the instrument, and also the mechanism of

the hearing apparatus, a knowledge of either of which Socrates would seem to have been ignorant of.

Then Plato, among his other great works, attempted to prove the existence and immortality of the soul by likening man to a boat and a rower. He seems to say that it is as necessary for man to have a soul to guide him as it is for a boat to have a rower. To him the human body and the boat are of equal value—which, from his point of view, is not much to speak of. The value and worth is in the rower or soul. Now, had Plato devoted a portion of his gigantic intellect to acquiring a knowledge of physics and the physical world, he might have been known as the inventor of the steam engine, and as the first man to demonstrate the power and utility of steam. Had he done so, what an incalculable boon and blessing he would have conferred upon mankind, and what a stupendously magnificent monument he would have raised to himself!

If Aristotle had had a thorough knowledge of physiology and a microscope, what might he not have done, in anticipating Pasteur, for the animal and vegetable world in a little laboratory in a back street in Athens?

And then what wondrous things would Epictetus have achieved for himself and mankind had he during his moments of recreation got a little knowledge of the world round about him, and thought out some of the mysteries and potentialities of magnetism and electricity?

These things having been accomplished, Marcus Aurelius Antoninus would doubtless have been known to us as the engineer who tunnelled the Alps, bridged the Hellespont, connected Spain with Africa by a submarine passage and built a railway to the Source of the Nile. But as these old philosophers did not possess the necessary light and knowledge to do any of these things their successors of more recent times might have availed themselves of the contemporary wisdom and won renown by becoming physicists *in posse* as they undoubtedly were philosophers *in esse*. Had they done so, what an incalculable amount of misery, torture, cruelty, oppression, tyranny and premature death humanity might have been spared? It will be said the world in the time of Plato or Praxiteles was not ready for such wondrous events as those I have indicated. May I ask why? Surely the golden age of Greece was one in which the mightiest achievements might have been wrought had the energies, skill and talents of the people been developed and properly directed. We feel inclined therefore to hold the various schools of philosophy responsible for the stagnation that eventually caused the overthrow of both Greece and Rome. Philosophic self-complacency and sycophancy were in no small measure the real enemies of both nations. By neglecting to educate the barbarian, the barbarian eventually overthrew the civilisation based on philosophy.

The metaphysician and philosopher with his farthing dip is still among us, ever vigilant to detect some innovation that might conflict with his views and interest, and to denounce and designate any new theory of a scientific nature as an ultraphysicism, as much as to say that scientists are but poachers in what the philosopher considers his exclusive province of metaphysics.

The venerable author of *In Quest of Light* has sought to be fair in dealing with the metaphysician and the physicist. It cannot, however, be said that he possesses the necessary practical knowledge of the physical sciences to enable him to discuss the subject as fully and thoroughly as it ought and deserves to be. Philosophers are prone to treat the physical universe as a mere conception, not a reality. The physicist, on the other hand, deals with it as a solid fact, and it is only through this material fact that the *reality* of the philosopher can be discovered and comprehended. The pathway to *reality* is hard, and entirely of a physical nature. There is no other way possible. By travelling along it we can trace the human mind to its origin. Along the same pathway we can discover the origin of individual consciousness. We know that we have no consciousness of any existence prior to the one we now experience. The experience of ante-birth or prenatal consciousness being wanting, we have no evidence to establish metempsychosis as a scientific fact. Conscious personality or consciousness of anything is merely the sum total of our experiences of anything in particular, and our experiences cannot be disassociated from our physical organism. Subconscious, or subliminal, experiences are those the impressions of which the normal consciousness is momentarily unconscious; but an impression having been registered in the brain the normal consciousness may at some future time become cognisant. The new-born babe is not a conscious being. No one is cognisant of the incidents of his birth, and a variable period must elapse between our birth and our cognition of personal consciousness. Consciousness then is the product of evolutionary experiences. Consciousness is a function of the mind; and the mind, as I have shown elsewhere, is evolved from cell intelligences.

It can be demonstrated that the most infinitesimal particle of living matter known as a cell, a bacterium, an amœba, a phagocite or zoöphite possesses a degree of intelligence, and this microscopic intelligence is the beginning or parent of adult intelligence, or mind.

If we consider conscience as the *moral sense* or determiner of right and wrong, it must be confessed that it is so as the result of thousands of years of experience. Experience taught primitive man to formulate customs and laws aimed to protect his rights and interests, and the law of *meum et tuum* may even be seen among the lower animals. The moral sense is, therefore, an evolutionary product

The sense of responsibility rests on experience, and the psychological operation which expresses itself in "Yes" or "No" is purely the result of accumulated experiences either acquired or inherited. To say that man is responsible in any other sense would imply injustice somewhere outside himself, inasmuch as he would be held responsible for the imperfections in his nature which were created and designed by a power other than himself.

Consciousness, or his accumulated experiences, may cause a man when he comes to die many regrets and much remorse; but neither regrets nor remorse at that time will avail him anything. His expressed regrets, remorse and penitence may, however, do good to others by adding to their experiences of life from which all men may gain profit.

Mankind, then, having expressed the truth or principle of right and wrong in the form of customs and laws, individual man, being the unit of mankind, must comply with those laws or subject himself to the penalty for their fracture or violation. Man is bound by a thousand tiny fetters which nevertheless exercise a very powerful restraining influence over him; and should he attempt to cast them off or break through them, he would most likely only increase the strength and weight of his bonds. Man then is in no sense a free agent to do as he may will. He must always remain in a measure responsible to his fellow men.

If our thoughts range beyond earth and our present state it is because of the experiences inherited and acquired from parents and teachers. Our first states of consciousness were directed by our parents to some object outside our terrestrial sphere, and the impressions then made on our plastic brain tissues became a part of the sum total of our experiences. There is nothing more supernatural in this quest for extra-mundane help than there is in seeking those things which gratify our appetites, the taste or liking for which has been naturally acquired.

The Ethics of the Anglo-Saxon world are said to be Christian, notwithstanding the fact that they are based almost entirely on the Decalogue and other Hebrew writings: and the Hebrew ethics are based on those of Assyria and Babylonia. The code of the great Babylonian King Hamurabi, 2285–2242 B.C., was written some centuries before Abram left Ur of the Chaldees; yet it would be difficult to find any modern code more replete with the sense of justice and regard for that which constitutes *mine* and *thine*. So that morality was taught prior to the evolution of Hebrew theology and Hebrew ethics. Is there any proof then that morality is being shaken by the undermining of traditional beliefs? I do not think so. Nor do I think a *moral interregnum* is impending as a result of the achievements of physical scientists. On the con-

rary, I am inclined to think the world is better, no matter from what point one may look at it, than at any previous period in its history. Morality depends not on any particular theological belief, or Japan would not have attained the position in the world's councils she has. If, however, morals be at a low ebb in Canada and the United States, or in any other nation at the present time, it is not because of the want of orthodoxy and secular education, but rather in the struggle for existence and gain necessary to meet the demands of modern society.

Clinging to tradition will neither save a nation from immorality nor from materialism. But the nation or people which ignores the facts of true science is very apt to become non-progressive, corrupt, and moribund. Orthodoxy did not save England from a moral interregnum extending through the whole of the eighteenth century. That period is characterised by Lord Macaulay as an age of low and dirty prostitution; an age when political virtue was mere coquetry of political prostitution; an age when secret service money was used unblushingly to buy the support of Members of Parliament to enable the venal Governments to put through their unpopular and pernicious measures; an age when the backbone of orthodoxy, the aristocrats and squirearchy, deemed it no dishonour to visit the Paymaster-General almost daily to get the price of their votes. The politicians of Canada and the United States in this age of so-called materialism may not be saints of spotless radiancy; but I venture to say, that as a class they are less corrupt and not less patriotic than the superlatively patriotic, but venal, English orthodox parliamentarians and politicians of the eighteenth century. Morality then does not always depend on dogma or creed. It is older than either, and I venture to say that the physical sciences offer a more solid and permanent foundation for morality than any one, or even all the various creeds of the world. The physical sciences are the newest revelation revealed to man by the all-wise, all-immanent and infinite source of knowledge. This all-wise, all-powerful, we will say Spirit, is teaching men the true value of morality and righteousness apart from dogma, and at the same time giving men a broader, more rational and tolerant conception of His nature. Notwithstanding the fact of evolution as enunciated by Darwin and others, I venture to say that religion has nothing to fear from the physical sciences. The individual mind will still feel its dependency on its parent, the infinite mind, and the relations between the individual and infinite minds will for ever constitute a foundation for belief of some kind. We venture to hope and predict that that belief will be reasonable and in accordance with the almost transcendant knowledge of the twentieth century. We must not forget, however, that all the knowledge we possess has been revealed to us by the Infinite mind

of which the individual mind is but an infinitesimal part, nor must we forget that as the individual mind is but a phenomenon of the infinite mind, we cannot consider it a finite entity without limiting the infinite. In conclusion we venture to say there need be no fear that man will dethrone Jesus Christ as the world's Exemplar and Ideal. There is no one but will admit that the human character of Jesus Christ infinitely transcends that of any other founder of a religion, and the world will continue to honour Him with apotheosis for His works alone. But when the whole world shall have been leavened with the positive and irreffragable scientific knowledge of the twentieth century will it or any part of it, continue to accord *personal ubiquity and immanence* to the holy mother of Jesus Christ and to the spirits of the innumerable host of minor saints to whom salutations and supplications are being continuously and simultaneously made throughout the habitable globe? The propounding of this question is not to evoke polemical controversy, nor is its purpose to disturb the religious convictions of so many millions of the human race. It must, however, and very soon, be subjected to the most critical examination under the most powerful searchlight that science can discover or invent. If science can in this way demonstrate and substantiate the reasonableness and absolute truth of the *personal ubiquity and immanence* of the greater and lesser saints, Mr. Goldwin Smith will be able to say: Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace—for light will have been found.

JAMES BAUGH.

OPEN LETTER TO THE REVD. FATHER BERNARD VAUGHAN.

REVEREND SIR,

I have scanned, with more curiosity than interest, the comments in your recent sermons on the actions and habits of those constituting themselves the "upper class" and select Society, of which we may term the ruling powers of the nation; and must confess that nothing new or astonishing was gathered from your—to my mind—mild comments.

If you have erred in your denouncements of a corrupt and ungovernable Society, your error arises from your inclination to leniency in accordance to what you believe to be the impulses born of a faith to which you personally and exceptionally are an ornament.

No doubt can be entertained that your remarks are the impulses of honour and truth, spoken freely and fearlessly, as one would expect from those like the Howards, Newmans, and Vaughans, on the stainless roll of honoured names and English gentlemen.

While being convinced that your object in justly denouncing the irregular and idle extravagance of Society, one cannot forget or omit the fact that you are a Jesuit, a member of the Society of Jesus, whose power and influence is asserting itself through the length and breadth of our land, instances of which have already been realised by the nation, and will stand prominently when future history is recorded in letters of iron.

You, without being aware of the fact, are only after all a tool of the Order—(a small pinion-wheel in the vast machinery construction of an ocean liner)—an Order the most perfectly and mysteriously governed, and most powerful organisation, almost beyond the ordinary conception of the thinking units of mankind.

The growth of the power and influence of the Black Pope has associated Empires and Nations in the past with wars, corruption, and extravagance among its "nobles," when in Rome they became imprisoned within its walls to suffer and starve for their folly, while the "barbarians" (Society's title) lay siege to its city walls as Alaric's army watched its gates.

Modern France became corrupted and suffered. Italy also

became infected, and drove most of her sons away from their native land, whose revenge brooded anarchy and assassination.

Whatever your purpose may be in adopting the text you have taken for your sermons against Society's wrongs and shortcomings, there can be no doubt in my mind that the power prompting and encouraging you has a special object in view. Whether that object may be to form or encourage associations to purify Society by weeding out the offenders, or whether to add to your great influence and direct its use to some new evil, remains to be seen.

The Church to-day is lamenting the multiplication of so-called "infidels," preaching against drink, gambling and immorality, but encouraging these vices and creating them in all their worst forms.

The State Church styling itself "Protestant"—the wolf in sheep's clothing—aided and supported the late Government under the late Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour, in a war which received the prayers of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Bishops of Chichester, Durham, and representatives of Nonconformity in the persons of the Rev. Dr. Campbell and others.

Goodness answered their prayers as the prayers of the Russian Church were answered, the victory given to the infidel.

The late Dean Farrar warmly supported war, and quoted in its support authorities in the immoral David and the butcher Joshua. Canon Knox Little was an eloquent supporter. I had listened to his discourses often with pleasure, and lived to look on his principles as regards war with hatred and disgust.

Wars, especially when unnecessary, like the infamous opium war, and financiers' war in South Africa, stimulates for a time a nation's industries,—eventually, like Society's habits, to become decayed and dead—wrecks, corrupts and decays the nation's manhood.

The great wars of the past have been for the aims of a corrupted Society in every case, without exception, and engineered by the Church.

We have a State Church to-day wearing the mask of two-faced Janus, one face with smiles directing its flocks to fairyland, with another face of the demon of destruction encouraging massacre, corruption and vice with all its evil associations, and events eclipsing the immorality, wickedness and vice of the Middle Ages! Why is the birth-rate declining? Why are marriages becoming less? hence the multiplication of unemployed, especially among women, and the decay of domestic home. Why is prostitution rampant and vice flourishing with its evil omens in our parks and streets?

Because Society wants to make money rapidly by sweated labour and bubble companies, and acquire wealth from the corruptions and

scandals associated with costly, useless wars, encouraged by a Press and Pulpit who have misled the people to add to their dividends and stocks!

Wars do much to desecrate and destroy the homes of the working classes, who ought to be a nation's backbone. Wars concentrate and collect the youth and manhood of the nation in positions that encourage immorality and vice and fill the ranks of unemployed, workhouses, and prisons, spreading disease in many homes and surroundings.

No ordinary observer can fail to be convinced that our country to-day, in its association with the Salisburys, Balfours, its Primrose Leaguers and Romanised State Church, has become infected and polluted in its Courts, Commons, and Councils, as France, Spain, and Italy became under the Bourbons.

Priests, monks, and nuns have during the past flocked to this country for a home and shelter, refugees from tyranny they themselves have created, eventually to work mischief, and above all to paralyse and corrupt the legislative machinery of the country and lay bare and unmolested theft, massacre and fraud, fortunately checked by the strong voice of public opinion and advent to power of a Liberal Government.

It is only necessary for me to quote one illustration of the growth and power, how it grows and ends, exercised by the secret influence of the Order of the Society of Jesus known as the Jesuits, who have the great task before them in the conversion of England, under the mask of the "Catholic Church," to the folds of Rome.

How is that influence used?

In the case of Quebec, whose inhabitants had been noted for their "piety," brought up under priestly control.

Her early governors were "military monks." When Jesuits appeared on the scene they acted the prevailing spirit of submission, and with their "noted craft," aided largely by the confessional box, eventually secured a remarkable influence over the community. A writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, 1904, points out that absence from church was punishable by law, as was also absence from confession.

The Calendar was filled with special days for prayers and purification. Priests, with monks and nuns, crowded the city in numbers disproportionate to the lay population. The "Conseil Supérieur" took careful note of the least religious laxity, and the pillion, the stocks, and a certain wooden horse with a sharp spine were the ready instruments of correction. Example of Law, page 5: "Any person going into the woods without a licence should be whipped and branded for the first offence, and sent for life to the galleys for the second, while the third offence was punishable with death."

Have not the monks, priests, and chapels, with their monasteries,

grown of late years since they got the encouragement of the ex-Empress of the French, who was the cause, through the Church, of the great war between France and Germany, so that her son might become Emperor?

Is not the feather showing the way of the tide the growth of the power of the "Order of Jesus" in the Roman processions that parade our streets? Showing the latitude that the clergy exceed under the growing influence so busy at work. Have we as a nation (of course, exceptions, and noble ones, to the rule) sunk to a degree of brutality that would put a cannibal to shame?

A recent brutal, unmanly execution of a British soldier in India. The rising caused by that unjust tax and its consequences, unjustifiable massacre with dum-dum bullets at its brutal executions, unworthy of a race professing enlightenment and a so-called Christian Church, for, unfortunately, a whole race gets a bad name, although the voices of those who denounced such atrocities are swamped and stifled by the gold-seeking patriots. For a war encouraged by the so-called Church of England we can look to-day into the gold mines of South Africa, where the gold-bugs thrive on the labour of 50,000 Chinese coolies isolated from women, whose ravages are fewer than would have been recorded had 50,000 white men been in their place under similar conditions.

The great blot in America's history was the slave-trade, and its horrors and disregard of human life. The greater blot, the civil war that followed, and the shame and responsibilities on those of its authors!

Brown's raid at Harper's Ferry raised the fire to burn the prairies of slavery which Abraham Lincoln confirmed and sealed with his life!

The slave-owners wanted their flesh, and now the mine-owner wants his gold, under a blot in our colonies under our flag that eclipses the immorality of Sodom and Gomorrah!

The late Tory Government came completely and hopelessly under the sway of "the conversion of England party," and left our country dishonoured, defeated, impoverished, with a debt and interest that we, like America, will hand down to generations unborn.

You have denounced the actions of certain units of Society that will figure prominently in pages of future history, almost eclipsing that during the reigns of Charles and the Georges.

The Victorian era will figure prominently amongst its scandal pages, most of which will be traced to the great cancer growing and maturing in the nation, of which the Order of Jesus or Society of Jesuits is the root.

I observe its growth creeping over the present Government, whose influence will be checked in dealing with corruption, as it deserves,

in a fearless uninfluenced manner, in a way that the nation expects without the aid of Society sermons, which only serve as an end justifying the means.

I have no reason to doubt your good and sincere utterances, and believe that, like other honourable and distinguished of your co-religionists, that the honour of the good name you have inherited will always be associated with efforts calculated to benefit the country and people on whom her great sons in the past have done so much, and which to-day threatens to become destroyed if lessons that good theology teaches be not ignored.

I ask you to judge by past events, of which in the limited space of a letter it would be impossible to fringe, and have no doubt that the conclusion will be one for improvement on the success associated with honesty born of truth, without which no effort of any nation or people can border on happiness while there is yet time to repair to some extent the great errors of the past.

The influence of the Society of Jesus has always been associated in the past with bigotry, illusionary and misleading dogma, untruths, tyranny and persecution.

The tyranny of the parish martinet is well known, most marked in the late Conservative administration, and in party tactics where opposite expressions of feelings were dealt with violence and ignorant mob law. "Religious" impulses, largely bred by the influence of the Jesuits, led to the terrible conflict between France and Germany. Its influence defeated the Austrian forces in 1859, when Field Marshal Hess, a man who had proved his worth at Aspern, Wagrum and Leipsic, was debarred from command because he was a Protestant.

Officers in the French army were given command on the same grounds that the commander was appointed to the Spanish Armada, not for their ability, but because they had favour in a desperately corrupted Court.

The late Boer War was to us in the twentieth century history repeating itself in incompetence, corruption, and wide misrule. Officers appointed to commands for which they proved themselves unfitted, for no Government officer of worth would have associated himself or placed himself under the "cloak" of incompetence which ruled at the War Office.

Lord Lansdowne's speech in the House of Lords with reference to Lord Wolseley confirmed this. Wars in the past have been the outcome of Society scheming associated with scandal.

The British nation lost valuable lives, lives that the navy and country could ill afford, by the act of Admiral Tryon, when the *Camperdown* rammed and sank the ill-fated *Victoria*. Evidence proved at the time that it was a wanton, deliberate act not to destroy one, but all of the ships! The outcome of Society scandal

information that I have since gathered from men whose mouths were closed by orders conveyed on the warships *Edgar* and *Phaeton* confirm that impression, "the outcome of a Society scandal!"

Preaching against Society's doings is useless, and only adopted as an end justifying the means. If Churches of any creed or faith are to be tolerated or respected, they must exist on the principles of truth, the foundation of good religion, good morals, good nations, good politics, and good people, and that lawmakers should not be law breakers. That for breaches of the law the penalty should be the same for the high and low units of the land, as the rain and sunshine falls equally upon the just and the unjust.

If Churches, especially the so-called State Church, sets its face against moving with the advancing changes of evolution of which Society sermons and shoddy dogma will not avail, the last resting-place of your Order will become as nations in the past became—a hotbed, and England must follow the example of all nations in the past and present, who have adopted education and freedom in its true form, from which—notably during the existence of the late Conservative Government—the nation was rapidly drifting.

Public expression of opinion at the recent election indicates that the nation is not without hope. Many, like the prodigal, have to some extent retrieved the errors of the past—errors that will stain the pages of history for centuries.

Recent events have shown us that the "feather shows the way of the tide," although they may appear unimportant, and, like the maturing seed, of no consequence in its early growth.

Our newspapers are constantly displaying events in prose and illustrations with regard to the growth of an antiquated dogma. King Edward's birthday celebrated on St. Peter's Day, his accession or anniversary celebrated on the same day as that of the Pope. Toleration of corruption upheld and unpunished by one-sided judge, unbridled military scandals, corruptions in our courts of justice, "the Beck case," and failure to deal honourably with an injured man, like the Dreyfus case in France.

France was led into error, yet France acknowledged it when discovered, and rehabilitated and restored a victim to falsehood unparalleled in history to his former position and rank.

What compensation did Beck get? A miserable pittance from a Government who did not stop at lavishing public money on their friends and relations. Many, indeed!

The brutal treatment of the Kaffir in South Africa, the brutal treatment of their executions in Egypt are unworthy of association with the British flag.

The German Emperor is selling his country to the sway and influence of the Black Pope. A certain address to his military cadets, warning them that if necessary they must be prepared to shoot down

their own kindred, rings of the true spirit of Jesuitry! His armies led to Africa, and butchered, as the Italians were led to massacre at Kassala, and as a conspiracy from some source was formed, to defeat our troops on the banks of the Nile. There is hope for us yet if the present Government stand by the pledges they gave to the people that returned them to power, which, if carried out, will do more for the country than scheming Society sermons, although they may be delivered in solitary instances in sincerity beyond question. The directing heads working mischief are in obscurity; the action of their tools is plainly seen, for there can be no question as to the mischief done, and plainly apparent to-day to every one who gives ordinary attention to the events of our country.

My object for this letter is solely that I have the country's interests at heart, and I believe that you have the same.

I have the honour to be,

Yours faithfully,

FREDERIC W. TUGMAN.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF OMAR KHAYYAM AND ITS RELATION TO THAT OF SCHOPENHAUER.

PERHAPS the most important element in the elusive spell that the astronomer-poet of Persia weaves around his readers is that garment of mystery that enwraps his real character, a character which a first perusal of the *Rubaiyat* seems to make perfectly clear, but in which every subsequent reading shows us some unsuspected subtlety, some dark depth whose obscurity made us forget its profundity, or some steep height whose elevation made us think its peaks but a part of the surrounding clouds. At one moment Omar seems to be a sensualist of the kind that a certain type of theologian is in the habit of holding up to the horrified gaze of his listeners as the fearful result of disbelief in his own particular cosmological dogmas; at another he seems to be one of those great spirits like the writer of Ecclesiastes, who rise once in every few centuries to record their detestation of that remorseless "Wheel of Things" on which all the children of time whirl endlessly to their own destruction.

Some forty years have now passed since Fitzgerald's magnificent translation first made the *Rubaiyat* accessible to the Western world; and yet we are still uncertain whether its writer was an optimist or a pessimist, a man who believed that sensual pleasure is the only good, or an amiable cynic of irreproachable character, who enjoyed posing Byronically as a "sad dog."

One is often tempted to wish that Schopenhauer had read these quatrains, expressing, as they do, a philosophy so like his own in many fundamental principles, and yet so utterly different in the practical deductions that it draws from them. We can imagine with what eagerness he would have assimilated what he believed to be true, with what vehemence—not to say violence and intemperance—he would have rejected what he considered false, and with what lucidity he would have pointed out where that error crept in that, on his theories, vitiates the ethical deductions of Omar.

But this was not to be; and it falls to one who possesses neither the insight, the reasoning powers, nor the attractive style of Schopenhauer, to attempt the comparison of the two philosophies.

Few of men's works bear the impress of their makers' indi-

viduality more indelibly impressed on them than systems of philosophy. We may or may not confess it with shame, but confess it we must, that we are led to adopt a given system of philosophy as much by sentiment as by reason. Having chosen our system, we are compelled to support its claims to validity to other people by reason and by that alone, because reason is the only intellectual coin that possesses the same standard of value to all intelligent men, whilst our own sentiments can only appeal to that narrow class of individuals possessing temperaments substantially similar to our own. Hence long habit finally induces us to believe that it was reason alone that led us to adopt our own particular system of philosophy, and we are rather inclined indignantly to reject the suggestion that individual sentiment had anything at all to do with the matter.

If this be the case with the followers of philosophies, it must *à fortiori* be so with their founders. We may, therefore, learn a good deal about a philosophy from the character of its founder, and *vice versâ*. In doing this there is of course always a danger of introducing *argumentum ad hominem*. The most unbiassed of men cannot approach any system of philosophy with a perfectly open mind, and there is always a risk, in trying to piece together a philosopher's character from his works, of arguing that, because his doctrines seem to us to inculcate views that are subversive to our own moral code, his character must inevitably have been stained with evil. To see how great this danger is, we have only to consider what kind of character posterity would have accorded to Nietzsche or even to Carlyle, if it had known those men solely by their writings, without having a knowledge of their actual lives to guide it.

It is just here that we meet with difficulty about Omar. If we knew his private life we could interpret his philosophy; if we knew how far his written philosophy expressed his real views we could build up his character. Information is wanting to us on both points, so we have to grope in the dark as best we may, taking care neither, on the one hand, to fall into the error of deducing too much from his philosophy as expressed in the *Rubaiyat*, nor, on the other hand, by over-timidity to allow the salient points of his character and teaching to escape us.

Obviously the first necessity is to arrive as well as we can at some conclusion as to whether the *Rubaiyat* is intended to be taken literally or metaphorically. In fact the crux of this question is: When Omar speaks of wine does he mean wine or God? Over this question much paper and ink have been expended, and the conclusion arrived at by those most competent to judge seems to be in favour of taking Omar literally. Leaving arguments based on individual lines and verses out of the question, it seems difficult to come to any other conclusion. We may take it as a general rule

that, whenever any doubt can exist as to whether a piece of writing is to be taken literally or figuratively, it is safer to take it literally until some very strong argument against doing so has been put forward. Now the arguments against taking Omar literally all reduce to this: If Omar meant what he said, and meant it to be taken literally as he said it, he must, if judged by the code of morals theoreticnlly prevalent in the Western world in the twentieth century, have been an immoral man, and it is not likely that so great a scholar and poet would be an immoral man. Now a mere casual glance at this argument is enough to show that it is not a sufficient reason for reading into Omar a meaning other than that which his words literally express. The argument assumes (1) that Omar's writings actually express his real opinions in some form or another; and (2) that Omar was a moral man judged from our standpoint. Now the first assumption is probably correct, as we hope to show later, but for the second we have no grounds whatever. Considering the age in which Omar lived and the people that surrounded him, the probabilities are that those qualities which seem to his apologists to have necessitated his being a moral man actually would tend to make him an immoral one. His superior learning, while we well know from experience that it would not necessarily of itself keep him from the coarsest of excess, would, in the age in which he lived, remove from his mind those checks that acted strongly on intellects far less powerful than his. His intellect was strong enough to make him despise the superstitious reasons that caused the orthodox Mohammedans around him to abstain from wine; whilst the lamentable example of some of our most distinguished scholars has shown us that mental superiority alone is not sufficient to keep those gifted with it from excess of which the most ignorant would be ashamed.

We must not forget that anything in Omar's writings that savours of orthodox Mohammedanism springs, not from conviction, but from policy. In every Jekyll there lurks somewhere a Hyde whose lower character often overmasters the higher one no less fatally in real life than in Stevenson's fable. Bearing these two facts in mind it will seem not only possible, but even probable, that Omar was not a moral man judged from our point of view. The fact of the matter is that all this spiritualisation of Omar springs from a desire to rehabilitate his character on the part of those who admire the poetry whilst they are shocked at the sentiments of the *Rubaiyat*. However well-meant this desire may be, it only tends to keep us from the truth about Omar and his philosophy, and we must therefore carefully avoid it.

We may conclude then that, within the bounds of probability, Omar was not a moral man, and that, therefore, if he meant anything serious at all by what he wrote, he meant it to be taken literally.

But the crucial question is, whether he did mean anything at all. Is he not perhaps speaking all the time with his tongue in his cheek? Is it not possible that all our pity for him is simply sympathy wasted on a man who is all the time laughing at us and consumedly enjoying the sight of the folly that makes us believe his pessimistic outpourings to be really the complaints of a mind embittered by the hardness of fate? May he not be giving some hint of this to those few of his readers who can read between the lines when he says:

> "But leave the Wise to wrangle, and with me
> The Quarrel of the Universe let be,
> And, in some Corner of the Hubbub couched,
> Make game of that which makes as much of Thee?"

These are not easy questions to answer. Omar may be deceiving us consciously, as we have just suggested, or unconsciously. If he did so unconsciously he must have been a Byron, if consciously a Mephistopheles. On the whole it seems improbable that Omar wrote down views that he consciously knew himself not to hold merely for the pleasure of seeing his fellow-men make fools of themselves by believing those views to be his genuine self-expression. It is noticeable that, in no lines of the *Rubaiyat*, with the exception of the last two of the quatrain just quoted, does there appear any trace of what we may call shallow cynicism. Bitterly disgusted indeed is Omar with the whole "sorry scheme of things," but his whole work breathes the deepest and tenderest sympathy with those individuals who, like himself, are bound to play their part in that scheme and suffer for its innate imperfections. We have a better opinion of human nature than to be able to believe that the author of such a verse as this:

> "I sometimes think that never blows so red
> The Rose as where some buried Cæsar bled,
> That every Hyacinth the Garden wears
> Dropt in its Lap from some once lovely Head"—

and the man who wrote the *Fable of the Wine-Pots* could all the time have been bitterly mocking those whose hard fate he pretended to pity. If he could do this he must have been, not a man, but a fiend of the pit. It is more charitable and probably more correct to suppose that that one cynical verse was forced from his pen in a moment of petulance, quite excusable in a mind so tortured as Omar's must have been if his writings be the real expression of his character.

But if we can acquit Omar of all conscious deception, we shall find it less easy to acquit him of all unconscious posing or Byronism. There is a kind of character that makes a most sincere man, and one whose life may have been not only respectable but highly

virtuous, pose as an amoralist or even an immoralist, without himself suspecting for one moment that this is a pose and nothing more. Even when there is ample common knowledge of the private life of such a writer his moral character and his message are often sorely misjudged by his contemporaries, as were those of Byron. And there is obviously a far greater danger of misjudgment in the case of a man like Omar whose life, nationality, and environment are alike strange to his critics. In such a case the safest course is to go by analogy with writers whose private lives are known to us as well as their writings. Any one who asserted that all Byron's verses on the satiety of sin were the real expression of his character, and of the whole of that character, would greatly err; but his error would not be nearly as great as that of a critic who considered those poems to consist of nothing more than a worthless web of insincere theatricalities, not only not expressing the real character and feelings of the poet, but actually hiding them. Now, if we compare the poems of Byron with Omar's writings, we see that, allowing for the immense difference in quantity in the two, there is still almost infinitely more that has an insincere ring in it in Byron than there is in Omar. The only quatrains of the *Rubaiyat* that seem to us to ring untrue are xl. and xli. and lxix. to lxxi. In xl. and xli. especially there is a strong touch of the early Byron who wrote *Lines by a Minor*. The same posing as a fine gentleman who feels it his duty to apologise to his fellow-rakes for dropping into such unfashionable company as that of scholars and literary men that pervades Byron's earlier work is seen in these two verses. Thus xli.:

> "For 'Is' and 'Is not,' though with Rule and Line
> And 'Up-and-Down' without I could define
> I yet, in all I only cared to know
> Was never deep in anything but Wine."

Here Omar undoubtedly refers to those mathematical studies in which he was so proficient. Now, however little he may have believed that a profound knowledge of the exact sciences could throw light on metaphysical questions, it is hardly likely that Omar would have attained the mathematical knowledge that he possessed without considerable study: and it is quite certain that that study could not have taken place if he were "never deep in anything but wine." This verse and the one before it may be taken then as a piece of unconscious Byronic posing.

Verses lxix. to lxxi. show Omar in the *Childe Harold* stage of Byronism.

Thus lxix.:

> "Indeed, the Idols I have loved so long
> Have done my credit in men's eyes much wrong,

Have drowned my Honour in a shallow Cup,
And sold my Reputation for a Song."

Omar may not have been a moral man, but, as far as we can judge, he took particular care not to offend the orthodox by his outward actions. "His credit in men's eyes" remained remarkably fair until men began to read his *Rubaiyat*.

But, beyond these not very serious lapses, there are few signs of unconscious insincerity in Omar, and many and many a sign of conscious and unconscious sincerity. We do not reject the poetry of Byron on account of his very numerous insincerities, we should not therefore reject that of Omar because of his very occasional lapses into petulant pessimism or overdrawn amoralism.

Having endeavoured to clear away these preliminary difficulties, and having come to the conclusion that practically the whole of the *Rubaiyat* contains a philosophy which is both consciously and unconsciously the sincere belief of its writer, we can safely begin our task of analysing that philosophy and comparing it with that of the greatest of pessimists—Schopenhauer.

That there exist the closest of analogies and the sharpest of contrasts between the two philosophies will be evident at a glance to the most casual reader who is acquainted with Schopenhauer's views.

The most characteristic features of Schopenhauer's philosophy are its transcendental idealism combined with a strong trace of empirical "materialism," its metaphysical doctrine of a purposeless, self-striving force as Thing-in-Itself, whose self-expression under the forms of space and time constitutes ourselves and the Universe as it exists for us: its deduction of empirical determinism and of the real existence of evil preponderating over good from this metaphysical doctrine, and finally its deduction of æstheticism as the temporary, and asceticism as the final escape from the evil of existence. It will be observed that we only mention the most striking conclusions without entering in the slightest detail into the arguments by which those conclusions were reached. The conclusions alone and not the arguments are at present our theme.

Let us now consider the analogies and contrasts that exist in the *Rubaiyat* with these most characteristic points in Schopenhauer's system. In the first place, there can be no doubt that Omar was a determinist, if, as we believe, the *Rubaiyat* is the sincere expression of his views. No less than eleven quatrains are given up to the expression of absolutely necessitarian doctrines. Omar's is necessitarianism carried to its logical conclusion. For him the expression "It was written" is the only key to the workings of the Cosmos. All around him he sees Nature from its lowest to its highest representatives struggling and suffering: bound to carry on the course of action set for it by something outside itself, although that course appears to be pursued

amidst the blood and tears of creation and to be directed toward no intelligible τέλος. Whatever it be that rules the Universe seems to Omar to have called it into being for his owu diversion, and to have set the machine going with no more thought for its sentient component parts than an engineer has for the wheels and cranks of his machine—less indeed, for self-interest makes the engineer oil the moving parts that they may not grate on each other, while this being sits and gazes with the apathy of eternal self-satiety at the wreck and jar of a Universe which, to him, is but a toy that a single idle word has raised from nothingness, like which a single word could create thousands more. From this chain of cause and effect nothing is exempt: prayer is useless, complaint futile, hope of relief during life meaningless.

> "The Moving Finger writes, and, having writ,
> Moves on, nor all thy Piety nor Wit
> Shall lure it back to cancel half a line,
> Nor all thy Tears wash out a Word of it."

Omar's idea of necessity reminds one of the Greek Ἀνάγκη in *Alcestis.*

> Ἐγὼ καὶ διὰ μούσας
> καὶ μετάρσιος ᾖξα, καὶ
> πλείστων ἁψάμενος λόγων
> κρεῖσσον οὐδὲν Ἀνάγκας
> ἦλθον . . .
> . . . . .
> . . . . .
> καὶ γὰρ Ζεὺς ὅ τι νεύσῃ,
> σὺν σοὶ τοῦτο τελευτᾷ·
> καὶ τὸν ἐν χαλύβοις δαμάζεις σὺ βίᾳ σίδαρον,
> οὐδέ τις ἀπρόσμορον λήματός ἐστιν αἰδώς.

So far the most orthodox follower of Schopenhauer could find little with which to disagree. True, he would object to the half expressed and wholly implied notion of something outside of the machine having made and started it, but, after passing over this difficulty, he could find little to quarrel with in Omar's pure and rigorous determinism. But from the ethical deductions of Omar he would utterly dissent. The *Fable of the Wine-Pots* expresses in a singularly fine allegory the fact admitted and maintained by Schopenhauer that our real character is stamped on us at our birth, and that it never changes throughout our whole life, though its appearance in space and time, which is often erroneously termed our character, can and does alter with our circumstances.

> ". . . . They sneer at me for leaning all awry.
> What! Did the hand then of the Potter shake?"

But what is Omar's deduction from this? Verses lxiv. and lxv. tell us.

The former verse asks whether we shall be punished for the sins that our very character compels us to commit, and comes to the conclusion that we shall not. "He's a good fellow, and 't will all be well," is the cheerful summing up of the matter. Schopenhauer can give us no such comfort.

Every sin is punished with eternal justice, for the very excellent reason that every injury done to another is really done to ourselves, since reality is unity. The next verse gives us the conclusion of the whole matter according to Omar:

> "My Clay with long Oblivion is gone dry;
> But fill me with the old familiar Juice,
> Methinks I might recover by-and-bye."

Sensual pleasure, says Omar as plainly as possible, is the only way to make this wretched life at all bearable. What says Schopenhauer? Sensual pleasure, indeed all but æsthetic pleasure, can but increase our misery: æsthetic pleasure brings relief but for a moment: nothing but asceticism can relieve us fully and finally from the pain of being.

As with Omar's determinism, so with his pessimism. Its likeness to that of Schopenhauer up to a certain point is only equalled by the sharpness of its contrast with it after that point. To Omar, as to Schopenhauer, the Universe with all its strivings is one vast mistake. So utterly and hopelessly useless are all the ends that men strive after in the Universe that the sight of their daily battling for what turns to dust and ashes in their hands would be the most ludicrous of all comedies, did not our close relation to the players make it the most bitter of all tragedies.

Compare the verse:

> "One Moment in Annihilation's Waste,
> One Moment of the Well of Life to taste—
> The Stars are setting, and the Caravan
> Starts for the Dawn of Nothing—Oh, make haste"—

with the words with which Schopenhauer closes 'Die Bejahung und Verneinung des Willens zum Leben"—"Vor uns bleibt immer das Nichts." The same man might have penned the two sentences. But now consider Omar's practical deduction from his conviction of the uselessness of all that men strive after, and Schopenhauer's deduction from his no less firm conviction.

> "How long, how long, in definite Pursuit
> Of This and That endeavour and dispute?
> Better be merry with the fruitful Grape
> Than sadder after none or better Fruit"

sings Omar. Omar thinks that because the highest aims that men

struggle for bring them no happiness, they should immediately cease to struggle for anything but mere animal comfort. Schopenhauer, on the other hand, recognises that the lower we make our aims, the further we are from emancipation. Kiss the rod, he teaches; for by it alone will you learn that you cannot be happy, and then, and not till then, will your unhappiness cease. Every one who does you what he believes to be an injury is really doing you a service, for he is driving this great truth into your mind; and the more cruel the injury, the greater is the service that he is doing you.

The pessimism of Omar is something much shallower than that of Schopenhauer. Much of Omar's pessimism springs from his thanatism. Schopenhauer, too, is a thanatist, but if he could have believed in the thanatism of Omar, who is so certain that the death of the individual is the end of his sufferings, he would have been an optimist, and no pessimist. Why trouble to persuade oneself that one is happy by living in besotted drunkenness, when, on Omar's own theory, a far more dignified and certain cure for unhappiness would be self-slaughter? There can be no doubt about Omar's views on this question of thanatism, when he says:

> "But come with old Khayyan, and leave the Wise
> To wrangle. This is certain that Life flies,
> One thing is certain and the rest is Lies,
> The Rose that once has blown for ever dies."

Schopenhauer's followers have no such flattering unction as this to lay to their souls. The rose, indeed, dies; but the tree, unfortunately, lives to produce flowers like it.

We have seen how closely analogous many important views of Omar are to those of Schopenhauer, and noticed how sharp is the contrast between the practical deductions that the two men draw from apparently the same speculative premises. It is now our task to seek some cause for this phenomenon. Why should Omar be a pessimist, a thanatist, and a determinist, and deduce as the practical ideal of life a state of continued animal enjoyment; while Schopenhauer, who was all these things, deduces as his ideal æsthetic contemplation, complete renunciation of the world, asceticism, and self-mortification? It is not that their different modes of life and material surroundings led the two men to such widely divergent conclusions. The last person in the world to be able to renounce personally any creature comfort was Arthur Schopenhauer, a philosopher living on a comfortable private income in those most unheroic of surroundings, a German town in the latter part of the eighteenth and earlier part of the nineteenth centuries. It is quite likely that circumstances compelled Omar the Hedonist to live much more simply than Schopenhauer the Ascetic. Whence comes the

difference then? We believe it can be summed up in one phrase: Omar was a realist, Schopenhauer a transcendental idealist.

The average man—in England, at any rate—loves to flatter his feeble mind with the belief that practical conduct is guided solely by what he calls "common sense," and that the mystical and obscure differences of philosophy can have no bearing upon practical matters. Perhaps the error of this point of view was never better shown than in the present case. We are firmly convinced that, had Schopenhauer known nothing of Kant or Plato, his ethical views would have been much the same as those of Omar; whilst Omar, if he had had the knowledge of those two philosophers that Schopenhauer possessed, would have put forward a system hardly distinguishable from that expressed in "Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung." In fact, to use an expression that Shopenhauer himself would have used, we believe that both Omar and Schopenhauer were gifted with practically the same "metaphysical character," and that the difference of their "empirical characters" is due simply to the different external circumstances that acted on this "metaphysical character," and gave it its expression in space and time. In fact, we believe that an intelligent Buddhist, acquainted with the facts of the case, would express what we have just stated by the more picturesque assertion that Schopenhauer was a reincarnation of Omar.

To Omar and to Schopenhauer alike the Universe was a place of useless and unending torment; but what a different Universe was Omar's to that on which Shopenhauer looked out! To Omar all that he saw existed *per se* as he saw it: space was real, time real, causation existed independently of the mind that perceived it. Outside of nature, and apart from it, yet existing in space and time, stood an unintelligible Being, that for some purpose unknown, but still for some purpose, had made nature out of nothing, had made it in itself as it appeared to man, one of its component parts, and had separated Himself from it. The machine was made and left to itself, but it had been made in such a way as necessarily to cause pain to the sentient component parts of it. Omar believes in an intelligent God, but as to His other attributes he is agnostic. To his mind the wonderful revelations of the mystic, and the profound speculations of the philosopher, can alike bring no relief. The Universe is a place of torment; therefore, since Omar is sure that there exists outside it Something that consciously created it for some definite purpose, that Something must be either evil or incompetent. If the Creator is all-good, He cannot be all-powerful; if all-powerful, He cannot be all-good.

Such is the Universe and such its Creator to Omar. He sees evil all about him in the individual phenomena with which he is surrounded, nothingness in the aims for which the best of men strive.

But, since all these separate phenomena are realities to him, and separate disconnected realities, he can deduce no reason in the nature of things why this evil should exist; nor does there appear to him any reason why the nothingness which he had noticed in the ends for which he and men like him had striven should be a necessary and inevitable ingredient in every action of everything in the Universe. His position is like that of certain mathematicians who have discovered empirically formulæ in the theory of numbers which hold for every number for which they have yet tried them, but of whose validity for any number not yet tried there can be no certainty until the formulæ has been proved to be true *à priori* by pure mathematical reasoning. Omar, as a realist, had no means of co-ordinating the separate cases of evil that he saw, and reducing them to one general law of *à priori* necessity, which should embrace the whole universe, because he was a realist, and, therefore, every separate phenomenon was a thing in itself, and unconnected with any other phenomenon.

Bearing these facts in mind it is not difficult to see how Omar deduced his hedonistic philosophy. He himself was a scholar, an artist, and a man of sensibility, and his friends had been men of similar stamp. They had striven for the highest ends for which men can strive, had found them to be but Dead-Sea Apples, and had died ultimately with ideals shattered and faith destroyed. There is something very pathetic in the quatrain:

> "Myself, when young, did eagerly frequent
> Doctor and Saint, and heard great Argument
> About it and about—but evermore
> Came out by the same Door as in I went."

But, as we have seen, the fact that the things for which he and those like him had struggled had ended in nothing, was not enough to show Omar conclusively, as a realist, that all ends that are struggled for in the Universe must necessarily end in that way. He no doubt suspected this to be the case, but, as a realist, he had no *à priori* grounds for such a conviction, and so he started to seek empirically some end, no matter how high or how low, whose attainment should not be fraught with pain, sorrow, and disappointment, such as had accompanied all the ends for which he and those around him had striven. And how was his search rewarded? He saw the stupid, swinish multitude, the Bœotians, the drunkards, and the free-livers far happier in the attainment of their low ends than the artists, scholars, and men of genius whom he had known had been in the accomplishment of their high ones. There is nothing strange in this. The more highly developed a man's mind the more sensitive it is, and therefore the more easily affected by the Weltschmerz. To the selfish sensualist the sufferings of others are

of no account. The only sufferings that he has to bear are his own; while the man of sensibility, in proportion as he is a man of sensibility, bears on his shoulders the sufferings of the whole universe. Looking at the question then from the realistic standpoint of Omar, the absolutely logical conclusion of the whole matter is summed up in the old words: "Eat, drink, and be merry, for to-morrow we die." With Omar's character, Omar's experience, and Omar's realism, we believe that, as an honest man, he could have come to no other conclusion; and that that conclusion would have been Schopenhauer's had not that philosopher been born in an age permeated by the transcendental idealism of the critique of Pure Reason.

How the transcendental idealism of Schopenhauer leads to his deduction of asceticism as the final practical aim of life is well known to all those who have read the last book of the first volume of his chief work. However, as we have attempted to show how Omar's character combined with his realistic philosophy led to his practical Hedonism, we shall conclude this paper by showing as shortly as may be how such a character, combined with the transcendental idealism of Kant, naturally leads to the asceticism of Schopenhauer.

We have seen what kind of a Universe it was on which Omar the Realist looked out, and how different it was from that which Schopenhauer the Transcendental Idealist saw. To the latter there was but one reality—the Thing-in-itself: space and time were but the forms under which it presents itself to the human mind, apart from the human mind they are meaningless, non-existent. But causation is unthinkable without space and time, so that the Thing-in-itself, whatever it may be, must, *an Sich*, be self-determined, lawless, and irrational. Here Schopenhauer finds the key to the whole mystery of evil. The Universe is but the *Ding-an-Sich* striving ever to render its nature clearer to itself. Reality is indeed *Wirklichkeit*, a continued "worksomeness" or striving. But, since the *Ding-an-Sich* is by nature irrational, its representation of itself under the forms of space and time must necessarily be self-destructive, for self-destruction is the only way in which absolute irrationality can be pictured by our essentially rational minds. Hence all courses of action, from the lowest to the highest, that seek for any end in the world, are of necessity doomed to disappointment from the very nature of the reality of which the world is a representation.

Here then is the crux of the difference between Omar and Schopenhauer. Omar only knew by experience that everything that he had tried had ended in sore disappointment; Schopenhauer, though he may himself have endured far less unhappiness than the Poet-Astronomer, saw that evil was bound up in the very nature of

things, and that the final end of all strivings must inevitably be nothingness. Here Schopenhauer's pessimism is something far deeper than Omar's. To the latter there may be happiness in the Universe—in fact he believes that he has found it in sensual pleasure—but to the former, with the same character but a wider intellectual outlook, there can be no happiness from the very nature of the Universe in itself.

But here the Transcendental Idealist can give a hope which the Realist is quite unable to offer us. We cannot indeed be happy, but we can at least escape from unhappiness; and the method of escape is through our unhappiness itself. When philosophy, or experience, have taught us the futility of all our desires all motives will have ceased to act on us; when no motives act on us we have ceased to have any meaning as phenomena, since we are no longer in relation to anything else. Our warfare is accomplished, and our labour is passed, and we obtain our eternal Nirvana by absorption into the primal unself-consciousness, which is unending nothingness.

We must live our life to the full, and expose ourselves to all the "buffets of outrageous fortune," until we learn the uselessness of all our desires, and, through the fulness of Being, arrive at the infinite peace of Not-Being.

Such is the ethical doctrine that we believe the character of Omar would have deduced, if it had been enlightened by the teachings of Kant. Whether it be true or false, who shall decide? The further we penetrate into the mysteries of life, the more are we compelled to re-echo the words of the great Philosopher-Poet whose philosophy we have been discussing:

> "For in and out, above, about, below,
> 'Tis nothing but a Magic Shadow-Show
> Played in a Box, whose Candle is the Sun,
> Round which we Phantom Figures come and go."

C. D. Broad.

GEORGE ELIOT AND GEORGE COMBE.

ALTHOUGH originality of thought is the initial characteristic and ultimate criterion of genius, it is nevertheless often possible to distinguish with certainty the personalities of writers whose influence has contributed to the evolution of a particular mentality, by certain characteristic peculiarities traceable in its methods of thought and style of expression.

It is impossible, for example, to help perceiving the influence of Goethe on the mind of Carlyle; or of Carlyle on the mind of Emerson; or of Goethe and Byron on the mind of Lytton.

The emanations of the mind become coloured more or less by the shades of thought and feeling which it is habitually assimilating, so much so that, though generally, perhaps quite unconsciously, its creations bear unmistakable evidence of the psychological pastures in which it has been accustomed to browse.

The law of psychic generation, the inception by a living brain of the mental expressions of others, is really as constant and unremitting in its operation as that of cross-fertilisation by which new varieties of plants are produced, with the retention of certain unmistakable characters of the ancestral type.

An interesting and striking illustration of this truth, which, however, seems to have hitherto entirely escaped the notice of critics, probably for the reason that they have been persons unfamiliar with the writings of George Combe, is afforded in the literary creations of George Eliot.

From early womanhood, George Eliot was personally acquainted with George Combe. In October 1852 she stayed with Mr. and Mrs. Combe in Edinburgh, and on other occasions both were guests in the house of a mutual friend.

Any one acquainted with the philosophical opinions and literary style of George Combe's phrenological writings, cannot fail to be impressed by the strong bias which they have given to the character of George Eliot's genius, and the important influence which they have undoubtedly exerted on its creations.

Miss Mathilde Blind, in her *Life of George Eliot*, tells us that at Rosehill, the residence of George Eliot's friends the Brays, "George Combe discussed with his host Mr. Bray, the principles of phrenology." And further, "George Eliot gave as a labour of love lessons in German to a minister's daughter, because she judged

from the shape of her young friend's head, that she must have an excellent understanding."

In acknowledging some photographs sent as a present by Rossetti, George Eliot wrote: "The 'Hamlet' seems to me perfectly intelligible, and altogether admirable in conception, except in the style of the man's head. I feel sure that 'Hamlet' had a square anterior lobe."

Here the phrenological bias is apparent; a square anterior lobe would involve amply developed organs of ideality and wonder; a type of forehead which George Eliot evidently considered the necessary organic concomitant of a temperament sufficiently imaginative to see ghosts.

In George Eliot's letters there are numerous references to Mr. George Combe, and to phrenology.

To Mrs. Bray she writes on May 6, 1846: "Tell Mr. Bray I am getting too amiable for this world, and Mr. Donovan's Wizard hand would detect a slight corrugation of the skin on my organs five and six" (combativeness and destructiveness), implying that they had decreased.

The reference is presumably to Mr. Charles Donovan, the founder of the "London School of Phrenology," who was then a leading professor of the science, and who had written a defence of it in reply to some eminent opponent.

Writing to Miss Sara Hennell, June 2, 1852, she says: "I had a long call from George Combe yesterday. He says he thinks the WESTMINSTER, under my management, the most important means of enlightenment of a literary nature in existence—the *Edinburgh*, under Jeffrey, nothing to it, &c.!!! I wish I thought so, too."

Miss Mathilde Blind, in her *Life of George Eliot*, refers to this period as "the palmy days of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW, when Herbert Spencer, G. H. Lewes, John Oxenford, James and Harriet Martineau, Charles Bray, *George Combe*, and Professor Edward Forbes were among the writers that made it the leading exposition of philosophic and scientific thought of the age."

"Lewes called on me the other day," writes George Eliot to Mr. Charles Bray, September 18, 1852, "and told me of a conversation with Professor Owen, in which the latter declared his conviction that the cerebrum is not the organ of the mind, but the cerebellum rather. He founds on the enormous comparative size of the brain in the grampus! The professor has a huge anterior lobe of his own. What would George Combe say if I were to tell him? But every great man has his paradox, and that of the first anatomist in Europe ought to be a startling one."

In a letter to the Brays, October 12, 1852, George Eliot wrote: "I enjoy talking to Mr. Combe (she was then visiting Mr. and Mrs. George Combe, at their residence in Edinburgh)—he can tell

me many things, especially about men in America and elsewhere, which are valuable; and besides, I sometimes manage to get in more than a negative or affirmative."

Writing to Miss Lewis, February 19, 1842, she says: "I dare say you have added, subtracted and divided suppositions until you think you have a sure product, viz., a good quantum—or rather, a bad one—of indifference, and forgetfulness, as the representation of my conduct towards you. If so, reverse your arithmetic, for be it known to you that, having had my propensities, sentiments, and intellect gauged a second time, I am pronounced to possess a large organ of 'adhesiveness,' a still larger one of 'firmness,' and as large of 'conscientiousness'—hence, if I should turn out a very weather-cock and a most pitiful truckler, you will have data for the exercise of faith maugre common sense, common justice, and the testimony of your eyes and ears."

Between August and October 1854, George Eliot wrote from Weimar: "In his (Schiller's) bedroom we saw his skull for the first time, and were amazed at the smallness of the intellectual region."

Some critics have said that George Eliot "constructs" character. It is, however, in the light of the phrenological idea that she blends the psychological elements of her characters, and the phrenological bias of her mind is the clue to it.

"To George Eliot," says Mr. Leslie Stephen, "of course, various psychological theories, Mr. Herbert Spencer's and others, were familiar. They were too familiar, we may fancy, when in defending Maggie Tulliver she appeals, as I have said, to the desirability of conforming to enlightened expositions of modern psychology. That may suggest a possible danger—the danger of constructing her characters out of abstract formulæ instead of reversing the process."

George Eliot recognises in all the complex relations of human character, with their tragic and grotesque consequences, the truth enunciated by George Combe, that it is excessive activity and wrong direction of faculties logically necessary, and intrinsically good, so long as rightly balanced by mutual restraint, from which all the discords, perplexities, and agonies of human existence arise.

In "Amos Barton" she tells us that "Mr. Pilgrim (one of the two local doctors) generally spoke with an intermittent kind of splutter; indeed, one of his patients had observed that 'it was a pity such a clever man had a pediment in his speech.' But when he came to what he conceived to be the pith of his argument or the point of his joke, he mouthed out his words with slow emphasis; as a hen, when advertising her accouchement, passes at irregular intervals from pianissimo semi-quavers to fortissimo crochets."

This was a manifestation of that exorbitant self-esteem which magnifies all personal possessions, and recalls the following observa-

tion by Mr. George Combe:[1] "I have seen individuals mistake the impulses of the sentiment under consideration (self-esteem) for the inspiration of genius, and utter commonplace observations with a solemnity and emphasis suitable only to concentrated wisdom."

Further evidence of Mr. Pilgrim's self-esteem is given in the statement that: "Pratt's patients were profoundly uninteresting to Pilgrim; their very diseases were despicable, and he would hardly have thought their bodies worth dissecting."

The head of the Rev. Amos Barton, who had sufficient confidence in himself to vex the souls of his churchwardens and influential parishioners by his fertile suggestiveness as to what it would be well for them to do in the matter of church repairs, and other ecclesiastical secularities, and who thought himself strong though he was not so—"nature had given him the opinion without the sensation"—is described as "a slope of baldness gently rising from brow to crown;" in other words, a predominant development of self-esteem, with but mediocre development of the intellectual organs necessary to logical judgment, and his character corresponds with his cerebral conformation, for we are told that: "If there was any point in which he showed an inclination to be excessive, it was confidence in his own shrewdness, and ability in practical matters, so that he was full of plans which were something like his moves in chess—admirably calculated supposing the state of the case was otherwise."

The distinction between opinion and sensation, in the description of his thinking himself strong though he was not so, is such as would only be likely to occur to a genius well leavened with the doctrines of phrenology.

The phrenological idea seems to have been an ever present factor in the portrayal of the physiognomical features of her characters, making them correspond with their dispositions and mental peculiarities.

Only a believer in the science of Gall, Spurzheim and Combe, could have made the cerebral as well as general physiognomy of lawyer Dempster accord with the brutally selfish disposition of that domestic and social tyrant as George Eliot has in the following word-picture: "He was a tall and rather massive man, and the front half of his large surface was so well dredged with snuff, &c. Mr. Dempster habitually held his chin tucked in, and his head hanging forward, weighed down, perhaps, by a *preponderant occiput* and a bulging forehead, between which his closely-clipped *coronal surface* lay like a flat and new-mown table-land."

It would not be easy to improve upon this as a piece of imaginative phrenological description of a powerful specimen of an animal-intellectual temperament.

[1] *System of Phrenology*, p. 183.

His preponderant occiput, the indispensable cranial concomitant of a grossly animal nature; the bulging forehead, indicating adequate development of the intellectual organs essential to the legal intelligence; between which—the back and front of his head, "his closely-clipped coronal surface lay like a flat and new-mown table-land."

This flatness of the coronal brain is the phrenological concomitant of extreme deficiency of the organs of the moral sentiments, leaving his powerfully developed organs of the selfish and animal propensities unrestrained by the feelings of justice, reverence, and sympathy. All the details of his character and conduct correspond strikingly with his phrenological portrait; the arrogant and ruthless brutality of his egotism; the malignity of his resentment; the lawless exorbitance of his animal appetites; the efficiency of his reason for selfish purposes; the less perfect information of his intellect upon matters of detail not directly connected with his professional and habitual work—as when he asserted in the parlour of the Red Lion, that Presbyterians were called after a miserable fanatic named John Presbyter, who wore a suit of leather, in the reign of Charles I.; and silenced Mr. Luke Byles who said Presbyterianism was derived from the word "presbyter," an elder, by telling him that he was "ignored by the very fleas that infested the alley in which he was bred."

Such words as "occiput" and "coronal" are intrinsically phrenological terms, such as frequently occur in the writings of George Combe, as does also the word "preponderant." "Paucity" is a word not familiar in works of fiction. George Eliot tells us in *Scenes of Clerical Life*, that the Countess was known to have expressed deep disgust at the extreme 'paucity' of congregations on Ash-Wednesdays."

"The 'paucity' of convolutions found in the cat, prevail throughout the entire genus to which it belongs."[1]

The combination of great combativeness and destructiveness with proportionate self-esteem, which enables Dempster to delight in indulging the spirit of opposition for its own sake, when such a course is not inimical to his self-interest—such as the patronage of a wealthy client—and to carry all before him in disputing with others, by sheer force of brutal, ruthless egotism, is in precise agreement with his phrenological features. Thus, when his efforts to prevent the evangelical minister, "Mr. Tryan," from coming into the parish, have failed, he says:

"There are many victories worse than a defeat, as Tryan shall find to his cost." And again: "Any coward will fight when he's sure of winning, but give me the man who'll fight when he's sure of losing."

These are expressions of predominant and unrestrained combativeness. George Combe says of this propensity:[2]

1 G. Combe, *System of Phrenology*, p. 78.

2 *Ibid.* pp. 135, 136.

"An individual with predominating combativeness anticipates in a battle the pleasure of gratifying his ruling passion, and is blind to all other considerations. His love of contention is an instinct. He is a fighting animal. When too energetic it inspires with love of contention for its own sake. In private society it produces the controversial opponent who will wrangle and contest every point, and 'even though vanquished, will argue still.'"

In delineating the "Countess" in *Amos Barton*, the physiognomy is made to phrenologically harmonise with the character.

"The black lace pelerene, and the black lace veil falling at the back of the *small* closely-braided head."

"The lithe, dark, thin-lipped Countess is racking her *small* brain for caressing words and charming exaggerations. The fair Caroline had had considerable experience of life, and had gathered therefrom, not, indeed, any very ripe or comprehensive wisdom, but much external polish, and certain practical conclusions of a very decided kind. It is true the Countess was a little vain, a little ambitious, a little selfish, a little shallow and frivolous, a little given to white lies—but who considers such slight blemishes, such moral pimples, as these, disqualifications for entering into the most respectable society?"

"In society," says George Combe,[1] "we meet with persons whose whole manner is little, whom we intuitively feel to be unfit for any great enterprise or arduous duty, and who are, nevertheless, distinguished for amiable feelings and good sense. This springs from a *small brain* favourably proportioned in its parts."

Contrast the foregoing description of the "Countess" with her small head and superficial character, with George Eliot's description of the "Rev. Martin Cleves": "Middle-sized, broad-shouldered, with a negligently-tied cravat, large irregular features, and a *large head*, &c. To a superficial glance, Mr. Cleves is the plainest and least clerical-looking of the party (the conclave of clergy assembled at the vicarage), yet, strange to say, *there* is the true parish priest, the pastor beloved, consulted, relied on by his flock; a clergyman who is not associated with the undertaker, but thought of as the surest helper under difficulties, as a monitor who is encouraging rather than severe. Mr. Cleves has the wonderful art of preaching sermons which the wheelwright and the blacksmith can understand; not because he talks condescending twaddle, but because he can call a spade a spade, and knows how to disencumber ideas of their wordy frippery. Look at him more attentively and you will see that his face is a very interesting one—that there is a great deal of humour and feeling playing in his grey eyes, and about the corners of his roughly-cut mouth . . . and if you were to ask the first labourer or artisan in Tripplegate what sort of man the parson

[1] *System of Phrenology*, p. 400

was, he would say: 'a uncommon knowin', sensable, free-spoken gentleman; very kind an' good-natur'd too.' "

Here, again, the physiognomical features and mental characteristics accord with the doctrines of phrenology.

"Other individuals, again," writes Mr. G. Combe,[1] "with far less polish, impress us with a sentiment of their power, force, energy, or greatness. This arises from great size (of brain)." "To infuse strength into the thoughts, and depth into the feelings, a large brain is indispensably requisite."

It is this conversance of her mind with the principles of phrenology, acting in combination with her genius, which makes George Eliot so consummate whenever she has recourse to psychological analysis of the motives of her characters in explaining their conduct.

Tito Melema, for example, becomes the dupe and ultimately the victim of his capacity for finesse and dissimulation, and we are told: "Tito had an innate love of reticence—let us say a talent for it—which acted as the other impulses do, without any conscious motive, and like all people to whom concealment is easy, he would now and then conceal something which had as little of the nature of a secret as the fact that he had seen a flight of crows."

"The repentance which cuts off all moorings to evil demands something more than selfish fear. He (Tito) had no sense that there was strength and safety in truth; the only strength he trusted to lay in his ingenuity and his dissimulation. Now that the first shock, which had called up the traitorous signs of fear, was well past, he hoped to be prepared for all emergencies by cool deceit—and defensive armour."

Here we have depicted with keen accuracy the play of a mind in which conscientiousness—the sentiment which gives the sense of the invincibility of truth and right, is deficient; and that of secretiveness—instinctive cunning, excessive; giving undue confidence in the capacity for concealment, and duplicity.

"When too energetic, and not properly directed, secretiveness is liable to great abuses. It then leads to a liking for concealment, intrigue, and crooked policy, for their own sakes; and to a feeling that it is wise and proper to wrap up the purposes of the mind in the profoundest mystery: cunning is mistaken for ability, and deceit for practical wisdom. It may prompt to the use of lies, hypocrisy, intrigue, or dissimulation, as means to gain an end."[2]

"It was a characteristic fact in Tito's experience at this crisis, that no direct measures for ridding himself of Baldassarre ever occurred to him. All other possibilities passed through his mind, even to his own flight from Florence; but he never thought of any

[1] *System of Phrenology*, p. 400; *Elements of Phrenology*, p. 191.
[2] G. Combe, *System of Phrenology*, p. 160.

scheme for removing his enemy. His dread generated no active malignity, and he would still have been glad not to give pain to any mortal."

This aspect of mind results from considerable benevolence with very moderate destructiveness.

"Combativeness enables us to meet and overcome obstacles, and, having surmounted them, desires no more. Destructiveness prompts us to chastise or even exterminate the causes of them, so that they may never rise up again to create fresh annoyance." [1]

Secretiveness—faith in his power of concealment and deception—is the prevailing feature of Tito's character; we are told that: "The question now was, not whether he would divide the common pressure of destiny with his suffering fellow-men; it was whether all the resources of lying would save him from being crushed by the consequences of that habitual choice."

And in the scene between Tito and Romola, when he has sold her father's library without her knowledge, it is with his deception that she upbraids him. "You are a treacherous man," said Romola. "Had my father known you were a deceitful man, &c."

George Eliot's description of the love of reticence as an "impulse"—"which acted as other impulses do, without conscious motive," is an eminently phrenological definition.

"Dr. Johnson," says Combe, "mentions of Pope that he took so 'great delight in artifice, that he endeavoured to attain all his purposes by indirect and unsuspected methods; he hardly drank tea without a stratagem. He practised his art on such small occasions, that Lady Bolingbroke used to say in a French phrase, that he played the politician about cabbage and turnips.'"

The phrenological distinction between mental *power* and mental *activtiy*, upon which Mr. G. Combe strongly insists, is again and again brought into prominence and contrast by George Eliot's characters.

Take for example the characters and physiognomies of Romola and her cousin Monna Brigida. Romola, majestic in physique as in character, is always serene by virtue of that effortless spontaneity concomitant of a mentality and physicality whose vitality are on the scale of magnitude which confers *power*. "She (Romola) has that way of walking like a procession," says Monna Brigida,—"the 'short, fat woman, hurrying with frequent steps to keep pace with the majestic young figure beside her.' Not that I find fault with it, only it doesn't suit my steps." The logical inconsistency of Monna Brigida's remarks are of the same order as her gait, they always culminate in something which completely stultifies the higher meaning which they might have conveyed from a superior mind. Her embryonic hand, which we are told was "little and

[1] G. Combe, *System of Phrenology*, p. 141.

looked as if it had been made of paste, and had risen out of shape in the baking," also corresponds.

The same phrenological principle is brought into evidence in the contrast drawn between the "Fra Salvestro," whose "face had the vacillation of a mind unable to concentrate itself strongly in the channel of one great emotion or belief—an expression which is fatal to influence over an ardent nature like Romola's. Such an expression is not the stamp of insincerity; it is the stamp simply of a shallow soul, which will often be found sincerely striving to fill a high vocation, sincerely composing its countenance to the utterance of sublime formulas, but finding the muscles twitch or relax in spite of belief, as prose insists on coming instead of poetry to the man who has not the divine frenzy"; and "Savonarola," of whom we are told: "Savonarola's voice had been rising in impassioned force up to this point, when he became suddenly silent, let his hands fall and clasped them quietly before him. His silence, instead of being the signal for small movements amongst his audience, seemed to be as strong a spell to them as his voice. Through the vast area of the cathedral men and women sat with faces upturned, like breathing statues, till the voice was heard again in clear low tones."

In his *System of Phrenology*, pp. 99 and 100, George Combe says: "In mental manifestations (considered apart from organisation) the distinction between energy and vivacity is equally palpable. On the stage Mrs. Siddons and Mr. John Kemble were remarkable for the solemn deliberation of their manner, both in declamation and in action, and yet they were splendidly gifted with energy. They carried captive at once the sympathies and the understanding of the audience, and made every man feel his faculties expanding, and his whole mind becoming greater under the influence of their power. Other performers, again, are remarkable for agility of action and elocution, who, nevertheless, are felt to be feeble and ineffective in rousing an audience to emotion. *Vivacity* is their distinguishing attribute with an absence of *vigour*. At the bar, in the pulpit, and in the senate, the same distinction prevails. Many members of the learned professions display great fluency of elocution and felicity of illustration, surprising us with the quickness of their parts, who, nevertheless, are felt to be neither impressive nor profound. They exhibit acuteness without depth, and ingenuity without comprehensiveness of understanding. This also proceeds from vivacity with little energy. There are other public speakers, again, who open heavily in debate—their faculties acting slowly, but deeply, like the first heave of a mountain-wave. Their words fall like minute-guns upon the ear, and to the superficial they appear about to terminate ere they have begun their efforts. But even their first accent is one of power—it rouses and arrests attention; *their very pauses are expressive*, and *indicate gathering energy*, to be embodied

in the sentence that is to come. When fairly animated they are impetuous as the torrent, brilliant as the lightning's beam, and overwhelm and take possession of feebler minds, impressing them with a feeling of gigantic power."

Here we have, in the language of the philosophical commentator, the precise distinction illustrated in Fra Salvestro and Savonarola by the literary artist.

"Fra Salvestro had a peculiar liability to visions, dependent apparently on a constitution given to somnambulism. Savonarola believed in the supernatural character of these visions, while Fra Salvestro himself had originally resisted such an interpretation of them, and had even rebuked Savonarola for his prophetic preaching; another proof, if one were wanted, that the relative greatness of men is not to be gauged by their tendency to disbelieve the superstitions of their age. For of these two there can be no question which was the great man and which the small."

In this comparison, George Eliot brings into prominence a much disputed question, namely, whether belief in the supernatural is the concomitant of mental limitation and logical deficiency, and her emphatic decision is in agreement with the teaching of phrenology, which shows that there is no necessary correspondence between the development of the organ and faculty which phrenologists call "wonder" or "spirituality," and the other organs of the brain, such as those of reason, so that it may be powerfully developed in an otherwise great-minded person as Tasso, Bunyan or Dr. Johnson, or feeble or powerful in an otherwise small-minded individual, conferring a proportionate disposition to belief in the supernatural.

In the versatile and talkative barber, Nello, we have another phrenological prototype; we are told after one of his wordy answers: "'No;' etc., answered Nello, whose loquacity *like an over-full bottle, could never pour forth a small dose.*"

In his *Elements of Phrenology*, p. 134, George Combe says: "Persons who have a great endowment of it (the organ of language) abound in words. In ordinary conversation their language flows *like a copious stream*; in a speech *they pour out torrents.*"

George Eliot evidently intended us to understand that Nello was a person so endowed.

An accurate knowledge of brain physiology is displayed in George Eliot's description of the fluctuating alternations between periods of mental obliteration and illumination of a brain in a state of senile decay, which Baldassarre affords.

"It all came back to me once," he says, referring to the recollection of all the conscious experience of his past life previous to his shipwreck and illness; "I was master of everything. I saw all the world again, and my gems, and my books, &c. I was

locked away outside all my thoughts. And I am outside now. I feel nothing but a wall and darkness."

In the scene where Tito is suddenly confronted in the presence of an élite party by his forsaken and neglected-looking foster-father Baldassarre, we are told that "Tito had never wilfully injured any living thing, but at that moment he could have trampled the breath out of a sucking child."

This, again, is true to nature and to phrenology. It was his love of approbation which was jeopardised in the presence of those whose estimation he most valued.

"To be laughed at is worse than death to a person in whom this sentiment (love of approbation) is strong."[1]

Mr. Casaubon is a character entirely in harmony with the essential principles of phrenology; one in whom, to use a phrase of Russell Lowell's, "the cerebrum had drained the cerebellum dry." The undeveloped and atrophied state of the organs of his social feelings has cut off those of his mental faculties from adequate physical nutrition. Hence, all his ideas are abortive and still-born for want of that vitality of physical relation which is indispensable to give the highest mental aspirations the personal equation necessary to their self-realisation, and forcibly exemplifies the phrenological dogma of the absolute indispensability of every faculty to the perfection of all; and that no faculty is a substitute for any other. Casaubon is a sort of human abstraction, detached from the living interests of his species, through the extreme attenuation of those conscious and vital affinities essential to make any one an available individual component of the collective personality of mankind.

George Eliot's remark that, "there is a great deal of undiscovered country within us," is eminently that of a person whose mind has been grounded in phrenological theories.

The science of phrenology, as elucidated by George Combe, was undoubtedly a powerful factor in the psychological genius of George Eliot. It is impossible for any one familiar with the writings of George Combe to read the creations of George Eliot without being incessantly reminded of the principles of psychological and physiognomical law as enunciated by him. Her creations are in no inconsiderable measure his philosophy assimilated to high forms of creative literary art.

Carlyle spoke truly when he said, "Snobs never honour the unaccredited hero." It is often painfully absurd to witness the importance with which ordinary people treat ordinary people, the mutual admiration and adulation of commonplace for commonplace, and the insensibility of such to the excellences of superlative and supereminent natures.

[1] G. Combe, *System of Phrenology*, p. 190

George Eliot never mistook an actor for a hero, or the vapid and bombastic platitudes of shallow self-inflation for the virile emanations of genius.

And for this profound penetration and insight into the most intrinsic workings of human character, she was undoubtedly largely indebted to the phrenological philosophy of George Combe, as the explicit educator of her splendid intuitive genius.

MAURICE L. JOHNSON.

INDEPENDENT SECTION.

[*Under the above title a limited portion of* THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW *is occasionally set apart for the reception of Articles which contain opinions at variance with the particular ideas or measures it advocates. The object is to facilitate the expression of opinion by writers of high mental power and culture, who, while they are zealous friends of freedom and progress, yet differ widely on special points of great practical concern, both from the Editor and from each other.*]

CAPITAL AND INDUSTRY.

> "The industry of the society can augment only in proportion as its capital augments, and its capital only in proportion to what can be gradually saved out of its revenue."
>
> —ADAM SMITH.

THIS is one of the fundamental truths at the root of the industrial problem, and, it is therefore, a good starting point for a discussion of the question. In order that its significance may be properly understood, it is necessary to add the definitions of capital by the same authority. He divides capital into two categories, viz., circulating and fixed capital, and defines them as follows:

Circulating Capital: Money, provisions, materials, and finished work.

Fixed Capital: Buildings, machinery, implements of trade, &c.

The term "finished work" in the former definition, is rather indefinite, but it evidently refers to those kinds of finished work, such as clothing, which are in most general demand.

Capital, therefore, is taken to be a comprehensive term, embracing all things that are necessary to industry, and if we so regard it, we shall not fall into the error recently made by a writer in the Press, who informed us that our industry depended upon the quantity of gold that the Chinese coolies in South Africa were able to bring to the surface.

Capital in its primary form consists of the provisions and raw materials afforded by the earth. The provisions sustain labour, while it fashions the materials after the requirements of the times. These requirements become more varied as wealth increases, because man's wants are always capable of expanding with his powers to gratify them.

Of these productions of labour, those things which represent the requirements of the productive classes, and are, therefore, in most

general demand, may be said to rank with provisions and materials as the circulating capital of the community. If any important work is to be performed, such as the making of a railway, or the building of a ship, a large supply of all these things is necessary to its accomplishment. The provisions and other supplies are consumed, while the materials are operated upon, and so this quantity of circulating capital may eventually be said to have been converted by labour into the piece of work that was undertaken. The completed work partakes of the nature of fixed capital, because it does not constitute that kind of wealth that is consumed or operated upon by productive labour, and which is thus readily transformable.

However, a vast amount of fixed capital has become necessary to industry. To this class of wealth belong the industrial and commercial buildings, and the machinery, tools, &c. With the constant improvements in machinery, all tending to save labour, the amount of fixed capital necessary per head of labour steadily increases, and labour becomes more productive. Although, in the long run, labour participates in the benefits resulting from labour-saving appliances, the immediate effect of their introduction may be very prejudicial to the labour of any particular industry. However, it is only by the adoption of all improvements that a manufacturer can successfully compete, and his failure to march with the times would be more prejudicial. Mechanical invention often results in the displacement of labour, but thrift is always working towards further employment.

Capital and labour benefit in common by the cheapening of commodities, and capital benefits a great deal further by receiving the same rate of profit upon a larger investment. As capital plays an increasing part in industry, it receives an increasing proportion of the results of industry. The proportion of the total that remains for labour, consequently, becomes less, but the individual reward of labour increases, by reason of the cheapening of commodities. However, the augmentation of the individual reward of labour is microscopic when compared with the leaps and bounds that are possible to the capitalist. It is the first steps on the road to affluence that are difficult. As wealth increases the paces become more and more easy, until eventually, the traveller is borne along without effort. The luxury of the rich grows apace, while the condition of the workers remains comparatively stationary. It is the system that conduces to this result, and the problem is, how radically to alter the system, without discouraging thrift, without driving capital out of the country, or, in other words, without injury to labour.

If "the industry of the society can augment only in proportion as its capital augments," one would expect to find the largest industrial populations in those countries which have the largest amount of capital at their command. But there may be exceptions

to the rule. A country that devotes its capital to manufactures requiring expensive machinery, and allows such an employment as agriculture to fall into neglect, must support a smaller industrial population than another country having a similar amount of capital devoted preferably to agriculture, and those industries that require the least expensive machinery and implements. Moreover, in these days of the telegraph and rapid transit, there is a far greater inducement than formerly for a capitalist to invest his money abroad. When Adam Smith wrote *The Wealth of Nations*, it appears that people seldom invested in foreign undertakings; but now the case is different, and capital is freely transferred from one country to another. This is a very important development, because it has rendered the nations less independent. Their welfare is, to a far greater extent, mutual, and none can greatly suffer or greatly prosper without several others sharing its fortune to an appreciable degree.

Great Britain stands first amongst the nations as an investor of capital abroad. According to the Income Tax returns, the income from these investments amounted in 1893 to no less than £65,865,306. Although labour is employed at home by the spending of these annual profits, it is a small thing in comparison with the labour which is employed abroad in turning the capital over and earning the profits. Foreign and colonial industry, therefore, benefits more from this particular capital than British industry does. If Englishmen had always invested their money at home, no doubt their accumulation of wealth would have been much slower, but we should have a vastly greater industrial population than we now have. The population would have expanded with the employment. There would have been a natural expansion, besides less emigration and more immigration. Although our industry would now be so much greater than it is, the position as regards poverty and unemployment would not necessarily be better than now, because if labour had augmented simultaneously with employment, that kind of unemployment which is due to the irregularity of industry would have developed in proportion, and other poverty would exist in proportion to the provision made for it.

The following table shows the expansion of our revenue from investments made abroad, according to the Income Tax returns.

Year.	Income.	Increase.
1882/3	£31,890,423	—
1890/1	55,488,832	£23,598,409 in 8 years
1897/8	56,639,666	1,150,834 in 7 „
1903/4	65,865,306	9,225,640 in 6 „

It is safe to conclude from these figures that the eight years 1883–1890 were remarkable for the amount of British capital sent abroad. Possibly this great expansion of our income from abroad began a little earlier, but the figure for 1882/1883 is the first of the series in my possession. During the seven years immediately following, viz., 1891/1897 the income from abroad remained comparatively stationary, which suggests that there was little or no capital sent abroad during those years. The last period of six years, 1898–1903 reveals an increase in the income of £9,000,000, but having regard to the enormous additions made during this term to our National and Local Debts, it does not seem probable that there could have been a great surplus of capital for investment abroad. If, therefore, our foreign investments were extended in these years, there must have been a corresponding extension of the capital invested in England by foreigners and colonials. The interest on this would not be deducted from the foregoing figures, because it would not enter into that particular account.[1]

It is interesting to turn from the figures given above, to the emigration statistics for the same periods and for the years immediately preceding 1883. The following are the gross figures for British and Irish emigrants:

	Annual Average.
7 years, 1876–82	175,964
8 „ 1883–90	254,521
7 „ 1891–97	183,851
6 „ 1898–03	182,193

From this statement it will be seen that the period 1883–1890, which was so remarkable for the sending abroad of British capital, was also remarkable for the great number of British and Irish emigrants who left the country. If this huge capital had not been sent abroad, it could have provided employment for all the labour that left the country at about the same time, and a great deal more besides.

The transfer of capital from one country to another, however it may be arranged in the first place, must ultimately be effected by a larger exportation of goods (in relation to imports) by the lending country, and by a larger importation of goods (in relation to exports) by the borrowing country. If a large loan were taken in the form of specie, the borrowing country would find itself with more gold and silver on hand than would be necessary for its internal commerce, whilst its other wants would remain unsupplied. As a result the gold would immediately leave the country to pay for other things more urgently needed. The converse result would

[1] Confirmation of these movements of capital is afforded by the statement on page 574.

be experienced by the lending country. It is true that a small fraction of the specie might be retained by the borrowing country, because its internal commerce would benefit by the loan, and rather more money than formerly would be required in circulation.

Any country may show a regular excess of imports over exports or *vice versa* without its representing a transfer of capital. The balance may represent money receivable or payable on account of interest, freights, insurance and other services. But when the "Balance of Trade" (exports and imports account) undergoes a sharp fluctuation, it must generally be in consequence of a transfer of capital. The investment of capital is the *cause* and the ultimate balance of the trading account is the *effect*.

The American figures for recent years show most remarkable fluctuations, revealing a large transfer of capital to Europe and elsewhere. This is commented upon in the Blue Book prepared in 1903 by the Board of Trade, in connection with the fiscal controversy:

"America is the only foreign country, so far as we know, which has made important investments in the United Kingdom in recent years, and the outflow of American capital, both for this purpose and for the re-purchase of American railway and other securities formerly held in this country, has doubtless affected considerably the 'balance' of exports and imports both in the United States and the United Kingdom in recent years; of course in opposite directions."

The following are the figures for the United States:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

Year.	Excess of Imports (in millions).	Excess of Exports (in millions).
1889	£2	—
1890	—	£14
1891	—	8
1892	—	42
1893	4	—
1894	—	49
1895	—	16
1896	—	21
1897	—	60
1898	—	128
1899	—	110
1900	—	113
1901	—	138
1902	—	100
1903	—	81

The sudden leap, in the year 1898, of the excess of exports to £128,000,000 must indicate that, in that year, the United States

sent a large volume of capital abroad, and it appears that the operation was continued for several years.

We know that during this period the Americans re-purchased a large amount of their railway stock from British holders; that a war loan of £30,000,000 was floated in New York by Sir Michael Hicks Beach, and that several American industrial concerns opened branch factories in England. But these represent only a part of the transactions. The importation of capital is revealed in our own Board of Trade returns by a sudden leap in the excess of imports. But for the fact that America was able to come to our rescue during this period of war and governmental extravagance, its depressing effect upon our industries would have been greater than it was.

Owing to the important unknown quantity of freights earned from foreigners and colonials, it is impossible to find out, even approximately, the ebb and flow of capital from and to the United Kingdom, but the following statement, showing as it does a period

EXTERNAL TRADE OF UNITED KINGDOM

(In Millions of Pounds)

Year.	Excess of Imports (including specie).	Income from External Investments.	Freights earned from Foreigners and Colonials (estimated).[1]	Balance.	
				Lent.	Borrowed.
1883	102	34	69	—	14
1884	92	35	69	12	—
1885	99	39	69	9	—
1886	80	45	69	34	—
1887	82	47	72	37	—
1888	88	50	78	40	—
1889	114	52	78	16	—
1890	101	55	81	35	—
1891	128	55	81	8	—
1892	135	55	81	1	—
1893	132	55	81	4	—
1894	146	54	87	—	5
1895	146	55	87	—	4
1896	139	56	93	10	—
1897	156	57	96	—	3
1898	183	60	96	—	27
1899	165	60	99	—	6
1900	177	60	93	—	24
1901	180	63	96	—	21
1902	184	64	96	—	24
1903	182	66	—	—	—

[1] See text for basis of estimate.

of ebb between 1884 and 1890, followed by a period of slackness between 1891 and 1897, and then by a period of flood between 1898 and 1903 is probably in the main correct, because the income from our foreign investments[1] shows a rapid expansion during the first of these three periods, and a steadiness during the second. For the third period there is no such confirmation, but, on the other hand, I do not think that there is anything to disprove the general showing of the statement for these later years. We know that one great nation sent capital abroad during those years, and that we were in a position to need some of it, and that we did borrow a very considerable quantity. It also appears from the income tax returns that we lent a considerable quantity during this period of want. One would not have expected this, but it could easily have happened if we had been able, as evidently we were, to borrow still a greater quantity.

In the foregoing statement, the column representing freights earned from foreigners and colonials is necessarily arrived at in an arbitrary fashion, the figures being three times the tonnage of British ships engaged in the foreign trade which were entered in the home ports during each of the years under review. The tonnage has been multiplied by three, because it yields for the year 1898, £96,000,000; a sum which approximates Sir Robert Giffen's well-known estimate of £90,000,000 for that year.

No attempt has been made to estimate the amount of interest and dividends paid upon foreign capital invested in the United Kingdom. Until recent years this was regarded as unimportant, but as a result of our borrowings during the past few years it must have augmented considerably. Its effect would be to diminish the credit balances and augment the debit balances in the final columns of the statement.

We have some further evidence of the relief afforded us by foreign capitalists over the period of the Boer War, in the fact that, after the outbreak of the war, the highest monthly average minimum rate of discount charged by the Bank of England never exceeded 6 per cent. After the Crimean War the highest monthly average touched $9\frac{3}{4}$ per cent., whilst after the American Civil War and the Franco-German War, respectively, 10 per cent. and $8\frac{1}{8}$ per cent were reached.

What America did for us over the term of the Boer War, they and others, including ourselves, have more recently been doing for Russia and Japan. Circulating capital in all quarters was drawn upon by these nations, and consequently the industry of many countries has suffered as a result of the war in the Far East. But the industry of the belligerents must always suffer most, because they must always contribute most to the war funds in proportion

[1] See statement on page 571.

to their ability to contribute; and they alone bear the burden of the debts which they contract.

As the dependence of one nation upon another becomes better understood, the prospects of universal peace should improve. But the false notion, that when two nations go to war, the onlookers stand to benefit, is much more popular. People can see the temporary improvement of trade in this or that department, but they are slow to attribute to the war the general depression and unemployment that follow. The depression is due to a shortage of circulating capital, as indicated by a high Bank Rate. At such times the minimum rate of discount charged by the Bank of England has for several years failed to touch the lowest point of 2 per cent., which at other times it is no uncommon thing for it to do.

In the following statement the years are divided into alternate groups, viz., those in which the Bank Rate failed to touch the

—	Years.	Average Minimum Bank Rate.	Months during which 2 per cent. minimum was maintained.	Emigration (Annual Average), British and Irish only.
1854–61	8	$4\frac{23}{32}$	0	137,469 +
1862	1	$2\frac{1}{2}$	8	97,763 –
1863–66	4	$5\frac{15}{16}$	0	181,222 +
1867–68	2	$2\frac{3}{8}$	15	147,584 –
1869–70	2	$3\frac{3}{16}$	0	194,405 +
1871	1	$2\frac{7}{8}$	1	192,751 –
1872–74	3	$4\frac{5}{24}$	0	212,037 +
1875–79	5	$2\frac{39}{40}$	20	124,503 –
1880–83	4	$3\frac{63}{64}$	0	267,507 +
1884–88	5	$3\frac{29}{300}$	14	248,827 –
1889–91	3	$3\frac{7}{8}$	0	230,139
1892	1	$2\frac{1}{2}$	5	210,042 –
1893	1	$3\frac{1}{20}$	0	208,814
1894–97	4	$2\frac{3}{8}$	33	162,400 –
1898–04	7	$3\frac{7}{12}$	0	194,942 +

minimum of 2 per cent., and those in which it did touch it. A period of fifty-one years is thus separated into fifteen groups, and against each is given the number of British and Irish emigrants who left these shores. It will be seen that when the Bank Rate is high the emigration figures are high, and *vice versa*, there being only two terms out of the fifteen that are exceptions to the rule and one of these terms covers only a single year (1893), and is rather of the nature of a flash in the pan. The term 1889–1891 is the important exception, but against this may be set the thirteen groups in which the rule is followed. This statement shows pretty conclusively that

at times of general depression, due to a shortage of circulating capital, there is a greater number of candidates to get back to the land, where, with a minimum of capital, they can obtain a maximum of benefit. It is the only means by which they can continue an independent existence. If the land could be found at home, they would not need to emigrate; but in the existing state of our land laws, it is fortunate for these people that there is a land across the sea capable of providing room for them all. General Booth has found out that the route to that land is the best "way out" of "Darkest England," and it is easy to understand that it should be so, since, there, the people may do what they are prevented from doing at home, viz., contribute their labour to repair the shortage of food and raw materials, which are capital in its primary form—the fuel which provides the motive power for all life and industry.

The Washington "Bulletin of the Bureau of Labour," for March 1906, gives the following figures, which indicate the course of wholesale prices, in the United States, under several heads of circulating capital, and prove a shortage as compared with the preceding decade, for which the average is taken as 100:

—	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.
Farm products . .	109·5	116·9	130·5	118·8	126·2	124·2
Food, &c. . . .	104·2	105·9	111·3	107·1	107·2	108·7
Cloths and clothing .	106·8	101·	102·	106·6	109·8	112·
Fuel and lighting .	120 9	119·5	134·3	149·3	132·6	128·8
Lumber and building materials . .	115·7	116·7	118·8	121·4	122·7	127·8
Drugs and chemicals .	115·7	115·2	114·2	112·6	110·	109·1

The general rise in prices is not surprising in view of the enormous amount of capital sent abroad from the United States since 1898.

The dissipation of capital by war may take years to repair. The shortage is felt over a prolonged period. But in the ordinary course of trade, uninfluenced by war, there may be temporary shortage. When circulating capital is plentiful there is a tendency to make use of it. Companies are promoted, new factories are laid down, existing workshops are extended, the building trade flourishes, large public works are undertaken, railways are extended—all to a greater degree than when circulating capital is scarce. The tendency is more rapidly to convert circulating capital into fixed capital, and the accelerated conversion continues until it is automatically checked by a comparative scarcity arising. This is indicated by "dear money," and a higher rate of discount. While the abundance con-

tinues, or, in other words, while the Bank Rate is low, industry is at its best, and industry is checked in proportion to the degree of scarcity of circulating capital which is allowed to arise through the conversion of circulating into fixed capital.

In ordinary times the minimum rate of discount charged by the Bank of England has frequently fallen to 2 per cent., but it has never remained so low for more than a few months at a time, because, as already stated, an abundance of primary or circulating capital invites its more rapid conversion into secondary or fixed capital, and so the abundance is depleted. During the four years 1894–1897 the 2 per cent. rate was maintained during an aggregate of thirty-three months. Since 1897 the Bank Rate has never been as low as 2 per cent. In the fifty-one years, 1854–1904, the minimum rate of 2 per cent. has ruled for an aggregate of ninety-one months, or, say, seven and a half years, or about one-seventh of the whole term.[1]

It is to the interests of industry throughout the world that we should have universal peace, and that capital should accumulate. The prosperity of a particular country must depend upon the amount of capital, from whatever quarter, that it is able to attract to its industry.

For the United Kingdom to support the largest possible industrial population, it is necessary that there should be access to the land, the cultivation of which yields capital in its primary form. It is true that foodstuffs and raw material can be obtained from abroad in exchange for manufactures, but the necessity of access to the land lies in the fact that capital devoted to agriculture, will employ far more labour than the same amount devoted to manufactures in which expensive machinery is necessary.

The extent to which industry can grow is only limited by the power which sets it going, viz., capital. Every nation is capable of enjoying the entire fruits of its industry. There is not any surplus which must at all costs be palmed off on the foreigner. What is exported is only for purposes of exchange or investment. The foreign market is already a very large one, and it is less desirable that it should extend than that it should not contract.

The wealth of the earth is developed without intercourse with the other planets, and so the wealth of any *great country* with a fruitful soil is capable of development without external intercourse, but with such intercourse the wealth is developed much more rapidly. Without external intercourse, a country's

[1] We have just seen the Bank Rate raised ½ per cent. on account of the *demand* for gold in connection with the movement of the abundant American crops. Here, then, is an instance of augmentation of Bank Rate caused by booming prosperity. But such an augmentation can be only of a transitory nature, and *the abundant* harvest must presently tend to reduce the Bank Rate.

development is only limited by its agricultural and mineral possibilities. With external trade, the development is based upon the fruitfulness of the earth itself.

But under the best conditions there must always be a lot of poverty in the land. It is not that riches beget poverty, but that distress and want are common to the weakest individuals in all kinds of life. If they are not conspicuous in nature, it is because they lead so quickly to death. Primitive man could not have differed in this respect from other creatures; but in civilised societies, with their poor laws and charitable organisations, some provision is made for the weak and incapable, and they become numerous in proportion. The human struggle for life is to be found in its acutest form, not by any means in the workhouses, but amongst those of the poor, for whom, in spite of their extreme want, the relief obtainable, or the conditions attaching to it, are not acceptable.

In a state of nature it is the fittest that survive, but in civilised society a strong man may succumb while many weaklings live. The strongest may be reduced to a state of want through losing their employment on account of trade depression, and inability to find other work. A better provision might be made for these victims of the irregularity of industry, and also for the aged, without causing that augmentation of surplus population which would follow on a more generous provision for the poor in general.

H. I. Ginders.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

SCIENCE.

THE second volume of Haeckel's great work on the *Evolution of Man* has now been rendered accessible to English readers by an excellent translation by Mr. J. McCabe.[1] While the first volume dealt chiefly with human embryology or ontogeny, the present one describes in detail human phylogeny and traces the development of the various organs of the human body from those of lower organisms. Like all Haeckel's works these two volumes are profusely illustrated; the production of a highly scientific work of this description, with more than four hundred illustrations, for the modest sum of one shilling is a marvel of cheap publication. Both parts are also issued in a library edition bound in one volume which should be in the hands of all who wish to keep their knowledge of the important subject of human evolution up to date.

Another popular work dealing with evolution is Mr. D. Hird's *Picture-Book of Evolution*.[2] In it the author discusses evolution in its widest sense; from the nebular origin of the solar system to the origin of the human race. The subject is treated from the simplest popular point of view, and the technical terms used are reduced to the smallest possible number. The illustrations are numerous and some of them are well chosen; but many might with advantage be omitted. An illustration of an acorn, for instance, does not help us much in realising the growth of the oak, nor can pictures of bicycles and their forerunners, rifles or pianos, advance our knowledge of evolution. These might with advantage be omitted, and the space devoted to improvements in the scale of some of the other illustrations. For instance, a sturgeon about one-fifth the size of a flying-fish is apt to mislead the class of readers for whom the work is intended. We can hardly imagine any readers who would relish the very poor jokes interspersed throughout the book, and in most cases without any bearing upon the subject of evolution.

Vegetarianism appears to be advancing with rapid strides, and occupies now a very different position to that assumed by the

1 *The Evolution of Man.* By Ernst Haeckel. Translated by J. McCabe. London: Watts & Co. 1906.

2 *A Picture-Book of Evolution.* By D. Hird. Part I. London: Watts & Co. 1906.

Vegetarian Society when founded in 1847. At that time the practice was confined to a few, now fresh converts are being made daily, and some of the most advanced members of the medical profession are to be found among its advocates. Mr. H. S. Salt's *Logic of Vegetarianism*[1] has now reached its second edition, and may be recommended to those who wish to acquire a knowledge of the main principles of vegetarianism. Among the general public it is sometimes thought that a vegetarian is one who abstains altogether from animal food; but, according to the rules of the Vegetarian Society, the use of eggs and milk is permissible. The general rule appears to be that life must not be destroyed to procure an article of food; but we must leave to biologists the question whether life is absent from an egg, at any rate previous to the "shop" stage. The method adopted by the author of stating his case in the form of a dialogue between a vegetarian and an opponent is scarcely convincing; such dialogues always leave the impression that the case for the opposition is not fairly stated.

Mr. H. Bigg's *Essay on the General Principles of the Treatment of Spinal Curvatures*[2] contains a record of the author's experience, extending over a number of years, in the treatment of the defects mentioned in the title. The method adopted appears to be a practical one, and is not so violent as some of the treatments that have been advocated. The patient, in as erect a position as possible, is enveloped in plaster-of-Paris bandages, and when these have set they are cut through and formed a mould, into which plaster-of-Paris is poured. This forms a cast of the body, which cast is then modelled as required and splints are afterwards moulded upon it. Each patient is carefully photographed from time to time under conditions that permit of accurate measurements being taken. The examples given show successful results, even in cases of apparently hopeless deformity. The latter part of the work is devoted to a very vigorous criticism of other methods of treatment, especially the gymnastic treatment, which is strongly condemned. As the causes of spinal curvature are various, it is scarcely probable that one method of treatment would be suitable in all cases.

Among the useful volumes of the University Tutorial Series none is more practical and concise than Mr. R. W. Stewart's *Text-Book of Light*,[3] of which a fourth edition has now been issued. Well illustrated and clear in its explanations, this book affords all the information required by those students who are not yet familiar with advanced mathematics.

[1] *The Logic of Vegetarianism.* By H. S. Salt. Second Edition. London: G. Bell & Sons. 1906.

[2] *An Essay on the General Principles of the Treatment of Spinal Curvatures.* By H. Bigg. London: J. & A. Churchill. 1905.

[3] *A Text-Book of Light.* By R. W. Stewart. London: W. B. Clive. 1906.

Another useful little work from the same press is Clive's *Mathematical Tables*[1] containing logarithms, anti-logarithms and other tables. The object of these short tables is to accustom the student to the use of mathematical tables, rather than to supply full tables for general use. This object is facilitated by a number of problems which are given together with their solutions.

PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.

Dr. Edwin A. Abbott, the well-known New Testament scholar and the author of the once popular books *Philochristus* and *Onesimus*, besides several works on New Testament philology, &c., has written another book in narrative form, the object of which appears to be a defence and exposition of the fourth Gospel. Indeed, the author himself states that the object of the work is to suggest a conception of Christ, not as a prophet, rabbi, or philosopher, but as the Eternal Son of God, incarnate as the Son of Joseph and Mary. This and much more is illustrated in the autobiography of a young Roman Knight, Q. Junius Silanus,[2] who is introduced as a hearer of Epictetus in the year 118 A.D. The Epistles of Paul fall into the hands of this young man, who is much moved by the strange ideas he finds in them, and is drawn towards Christ; he then procures the Synoptic Gospels, the reading of which cools his ardour, but coming under the influence of a Christian he studies the fourth Gospel and through it becomes converted. The book is a theological treatise in the form of a narrative, and the incidents are consequently few and trivial. The description of Epictetus as a lecturer, and two or three of his disciples, is the best thing in the book, though the suggestion that Epictetus was in some measure indebted to Christians for some of his ideas is not convincing. The book is subtly ingenious, but the special pleading is too obvious, and the rapidity with which the young Roman masters the difficulties of St. Paul and of some parts of the Old Testament is incredible; but it is practically confessed that he could not have understood the fourth Gospel without the aid of Clemens, an experienced Christian. The contrast suggested between Epictetus and Christ is misleading, a fair contrast between Jesus of Nazareth and Epictetus, between one man and another, would be interesting and fair, but no com-

[1] *Clive's Mathematical Tables.* London: W. B. Clive. 1906.
[2] *Silanus the Christian.* By Edwin A. Abbott. London: Adam & Charles Black. 1906.

parison can be made between a man and the mythological creation of the imaginative and theosophical author of the fourth Gospel. Theologically Dr. Abbott's position is a curious one, as he rejects miracles, including the Virgin Birth and bodily resurrection of Jesus, yet maintains the supernatural character of his person, not on the basis of history, but of emotion and language. No doubt a good many Christians will welcome this sophistical defence of their doctrines. The book will scarcely interest the critic or the sceptic, and even the scientific theologian will not care much for Dr. Abbott's peculiar exegesis. Silvanus and his friends talk too much in the style of the author, and for whole pages we have to listen to Dr. Abbott expounding, in the manner of a philologist, the obscurer and more mystical parts of Scripture. In its way the work is one by a master, but it seems to us belated in the present century.

The publication, unavoidably delayed, of the late Bishop of Durham's edition of St. Paul's *Epistle to the Ephesians*[1] will be welcomed with interest by New Testament scholars, and as the editor says, especially by those in the University which owes so much to Dr. B. F. Westcott. It would be out of place in these pages to enter into any controversial matters in connection with a work of the kind, especially as both Dr. Westcott and his editor (J. M. S.) have studiously avoided anything of an argumentative nature; though it may be necessary in justice to ourselves to say that we entirely dissent from the opinion that St. Paul was the author of this epistle; with this *proviso* we are able to speak in the highest terms of the work itself. It is a matter of regret that Dr. Westcott left the work incomplete, but the editor has evidently most religiously preserved every fragment which the Bishop had prepared to make it so. It should, however, at once be said that the Greek Text and the Commentary upon it were completed by Dr. Westcott himself, so that readers will have in the principal part of the book the full advantage of his learning and teaching. From his point of view (which is not ours) the commentary is all that can be desired, and the text itself is as perfect as we should expect from such a distinguished scholar. Unhappily there is no introduction, for had it been completed, which it was not (and the editor judiciously refrained compiling one from mere notes), it would have been the most valuable part of the work. We can do no more than indicate some of the material which supplements the text and notes. The introductory notes include a list of Greek MSS. and different versions and commentaries, some notes and quotations bearing upon the external evidence of authorship, peculiarities of style and language, its relation to other epistles and apostolic writings, and finally the plan and characteristics of the

[1] *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians.* The Greek Text, with Notes and Addenda. By the late Brooke Foss Westcott, D.D., D.C.L. London: Macmillan & Co. 1906.

Epistle. Jerome's Latin version and the English versions of Wiclif (1380) and Tyndale (1534) are given in the supplementary pages, followed by an analysis of the theology of the Epistle. This volume will no doubt be received with great satisfaction by the numerous admirers of the revered late Bishop of Durham.

Professor William Benjamin Smith, the author of *Der Vorchristliche Jesus*,[1] is an American mathematician, but any misgiving which those unacquainted with his writings may have as to his fitness to deal with theological questions should be at once removed on perusal of the preface to his book, contributed by Professor Paul Wilhelm Schmiedel, who, although not agreeing with the author's conclusions, pays generous testimony to his profound erudition and the great skill with which he has marshalled his facts. Indeed, he admits that in Professor W. B. Smith the student will meet with a man whom he will find it no easy task to contradict, inasmuch as the theological knowledge possessed by this professor of mathematics is by no means the property of every theologian. He mentions that Professor Smith once wrote to him that though his vocation is mathematics, his avocation is theology, an opinion to which this volume lends support. The author's position is not a new one, as the readers of Mr. John M. Robertson will recognise, although with the latter, as Professor Schmiedel points out, even Peter becomes a mythological figure. It would lead us too far to deal separately with the essays in this volume, of which one, "Saeculi Silentium," is here printed for the first time. We must content ourselves with giving in a few words a general outline of the author's position. Professor Smith seeks to prove that the Jesus cult was pre-Christian, current among the Jews and especially among the Hellenists, from about 100 years B.C. till about 100 years A.D., that it was a gradual growth, and that Christianity, instead of spreading from only one point (Jerusalem), had various starting points. He cites the case of Apollos, mentioned in the Acts, who taught the Gospel or "the way of the Lord," although he only knew of John's baptism and had heard nothing of Jesus as an historical person; of the finding by St. Paul at Ephesus of some disciples who were in a similar state; of Simon Magus, between whose creed and that of Philip the deacon who converted him, there must have been an intimate and sympathetic connection, as witnessed by the testimony of the oldest Christian authorities, including Irenæus; of Ananias of Damascus; of Priscilla and Aquila, who left Rome and came to Corinth, where they, *already Christians*, joined Paul, no mention being made of their having been converted by him, and so on. Professor Smith refers to the Paris Papyrus, (edited by C. Wessely), which, reputed of Hebrew origin (essenic or therapeutic), and

[1] *Der Vorchristliche Jesus, nebst Weiteren Vorstudien zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Urchristentums.* William Benjamin Smith. Mit einem vorworte von Paul Wilhelm Schmiedel. Giessen: Alfred Töpleman. London: Williams and Norgate. 1906.

showing no sign of Christian influence, mentions the name of Jesus as God of the Hebrews used in exorcism. In fact, according to our author's view, Jesus was a theological person; a God, the King of Kings, the Saviour, a protecting divinity, and Mr. Smith suggests that this fact explains the easy victory of Athanasius over the Arians, as every attempt to derive Christianity from a man must fail. Professor Smith gives large extracts from Epiphanius, which show that a sect called the Nasaraioi, or Nazarenes, (not to be confounded with the Nazarites or Nazirites) existed before Christ and knew nothing of him. He contends that the name Nazōraios attached to Jesus had nothing to do with a "town called Nazareth," especially as there is no proof that any such town existed at the beginning of the Christian era; but that it is a descriptive by-name meaning protector, guardian &c. (Hüter, Wächter), and was known among the Hebrews in that sense for hundreds of years; that it is on a par with such combinations, as Zeus-Xenios, Hermes Psychopompos, Javeh s'b'aôth, &c., which by-names express the idea of a divine power in regard to the protector or Saviour's person. The Anastasis is not a resurrection of the body, and originally had no such meaning, but is the "Erweckung," or raising up, or installation of Jesus as the representative of Jehovah, the Old Testament affording examples of the use of the word in this sense. The essays may be said to equal one another in interest, but perhaps there is more novelty in the fourth—"Der Saemann sät der Logos," a discussion on the Parable of the Sower. In addition to the version of the Gospels the author mentions an older Naassene or pre-Christian version as found in the *Philosophumena* of Hippolytus, which had a common source with that in the Synoptics, or from which even the latter may have been taken. In the Naassene version the Sower is God himself, the seed (world-seed) the spermatic Logos, and the three kinds of ground are the material or earthy, the psychic or natural, and pneumatic or spiritual. This threefold division was well known and figures in the writings of Paul, though in the last essay—"Saeculi Silentium"—the author endeavours to prove that nothing was known of Paul's Epistle to the Romans till about the year 160 after Christ. It will be seen that Professor Smith has given theologians ample ground and opportunity for criticism, of which, no doubt, they will avail themselves. We regret, with Professor Schmiedel, that this book does not give us the author's case rounded off and complete, but we can give unqualified praise to the way in which the work, so far as it goes, is done. The author himself admits that these introductory studies are more calculated to raise questions than to solve them. We look forward to seeing, in time, the whole of Professor W. B. Smith's *Bewismaterial* gathered together in one volume. In the meantime we can only say to the intending readers of the present

volume that there is an intellectual and philological treat in store for them. The volume is printed on good paper and in Roman type, which makes it pleasanter for the English student.

SOCIOLOGY, POLITICS, AND JURISPRUDENCE.

It was a happy thought for the University of Manchester to include in its Historical Series *Studies of Roman Imperialism*,[1] by the late William T. Arnold. It is edited by Mr. Edward Fiddes, and a memoir of the author is contributed by his sister, Mrs. Humphry Ward, and his colleague on the *Manchester Guardian*, Mr. C. E. Montague. The grandson of Arnold of Rugby, a nephew of Matthew, and a son of that troubled soul, Thomas Arnold, the intimate of Newman, W. T. Arnold, was by heredity and instinct an historian, and by circumstances one of the ablest journalists of his day. Educated at Rugby and Oxford, Arnold expiated his failure to reach a first-class in Greats by gaining the Arnold Prize for an essay on Roman Provincial Administration, which still remains the classic English work on this subject. The present *Studies* are but a fragment of a projected work on the history of the early Roman Empire, which had been the ambition of his life. At his premature death, Arnold left behind him eight chapters, seven of which are now published, and none of which had received final revision at his hands. In these fragments, however, in spite of some inconsistencies, we find the spirit of the true historian who seeks to explain the present by past events, and to trace the growth and development of modern nationalities which arose from the ruins of Roman civilisation. An Imperialist in the best sense of the word, Arnold was quick to observe the close analogies presented between the ideal of Roman Imperialism and that of the British Empire in their attempts to unite liberty with empire: the Pax Romana—the Pax Britannica. Moreover, Arnold was a rare scholar, and had his health been spared, in spite of manifold distractions and his weakness for wandering off the main track in search of side issues of minor importance, he would have left a work which would have placed him in the front rank of modern historians. In chapters i. and ii. Arnold deals, with a masterly hand, with the

[1] *Studies of Roman Imperialism.* By W. T. Arnold, M.A. Edited by Edward Fiddes, M.A., Special Lecturer in Roman History. With a Memoir of the Author by Mrs. Humphry Ward and C. E. Montague. Manchester: At the University Press. 1906.

constitution established by Augustus, and with the position of the Senate therein—the Dyarchy, as it has been called. In the organisation of Gaul and Spain, Arnold traces the making of modern France and Spain, giving the key to their history. A similar task is attempted for Arabia, Egypt, and Greece in chapter vi., and for Asia Minor in chapter vii., the least successful chapter in the series. It is scarcely necessary to add that the memoir is written with that sympathetic charm and felicity of expression which are associated with Mrs. Humphry Ward.

It is ten years since Mr. Theodore Dodd published his *Administrative Reform and the Local Government Board*,[1] the object of which was to urge administrative as opposed to legislative reform in our Poor Laws. Much which is there advocated has been accomplished but much still remains to be effected, and until the Poor Laws are cast into the legislative melting pot, the measures recommended by Mr. Dodd appear to be the only means of dealing with the crying evils which undoubtedly exist. In the present edition, says Mr. Dodd, the three most serious evils are disease, destitution and drink, and these are preventable. And he maintains they can be prevented to a large extent, without fresh legislation, by the Local Government Board. With the example of Mr. Asquith at the Home Office during the last liberal administration, there is little doubt that Mr. John Burns, backed up by public opinion, could revolutionise Poor Law administration. Some such revolution is sadly needed. Amongst the remedies suggested by Mr. Dodd are increased facilities for medical relief for young children and their mothers and potential mothers; organised efforts to fight the drink curse; more humane treatment of the aged poor and provision of work for the able-bodied unemployed. Mr. Dodd is an expert on this subject. He writes with the knowledge of a lawyer and the experience of an administrator which he has gained as a councillor and guardian for the City of Oxford. He has moreover the sympathy of a humanist. This little book should be widely appreciated.

Building Societies,[2] by Sir Edward Brabrook, late Registrar of Friendly Societies, is the title of a popular treatise intended to show the social value of building societies and to advocate their extension on right principles. The disastrous ruin to all concerned which has attended so many of these institutions—of which the Liberator is a notable example—has shaken the public confidence to a very large extent, and to a larger extent than the case deserved. Losses have occurred usually through the fraud of the manager, and sometimes through his incompetence. And yet all this is preventable by increased supervision by the directors. That every man should own his own

[1] *Administrative Reform and the Local Government Board.* By J. Theodore Dodd, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. Second Edition. London: P. S. King & Son. 1906.

[2] *Building Societies.* By Sir Edward Brabrook, C.B. London: P. S. King and Son. 1906.

house is an ideal which has great advantages to society, but which in its present form is not an ideal to which we can subscribe wholeheartedly. It is undoubtedly conducive to thrift, but the system enables a man not only to own his own house but to become in his turn a landlord, thus increasing the evil which the system is designed to prevent. However, it may be regarded as a temporary phase in the development of property in land, and in the meantime Sir Edward's contribution will be found eminently useful, not only to members of these societies, but to those who wish to acquire authoritative information on the subject.

In *An Epoch in Irish History*,[1] Professor Mahaffy has traced the foundation and early fortunes of Trinity College, Dublin. But, however interesting this may be to its *alumni*, outsiders will be chiefly interested in the masterly sketch given by the Professor of the causes which led to the foundation of the College and in the picture of the condition of Ireland at this period. Had the foundation taken place in Henry VIII.'s reign, or even in that of Elizabeth, Irish history would have had to be rewritten. As the Professor clearly shows the struggle between England and Ireland up to this period had been racial, but to racial enmity was added that of creed. But for the blunders of successive English Governments, nay even in spite of them, but for this the Irish Question would have been settled long ago. This religious cleavage was produced of set purpose by the Jesuits. The College was designed to meet this attack, but it was delayed too long, and when the College was at last instituted in 1592, the Jesuits had completed their task. In this, the second edition, Professor Mahaffy has made several important corrections and additions.

Until we have a more universal system of Training Colleges for Teachers, the latter cannot do better than read, learn, and inwardly digest the *Principles and Methods of Teaching*,[2] by Mr. James Welton. The idea upon which the work is based is not "setting forth explicit directions how to carry out every small piece of teaching," but that of a "consistent and co-ordinated body of doctrine." The teacher will therefore find in this eminently valuable book, not only the general principles of the art of teaching but the method to be adopted in teaching a particular subject. In the latter case each subject is treated by an expert.

No apology is needed for another edition of Paine's *Rights of Man*,[3] edited by Mrs. Hypatia Bradlaugh Bonner. The task, no light one, could not have been entrusted to better hands than to

[1] *An Epoch in Irish History.* Trinity College, Dublin: Its Foundation and Early Fortunes, 1591–1660. By John Pentland Mahaffy, C.V.O., D.D. Second Edition. With a New Preface. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1906.

[2] *Principles and Methods of Teaching.* By James Welton, M.A. London: W. B. Clive. 1906.

[3] *Rights of Man.* By Thomas Paine. Edited by Hypatia Bradlaugh Bonner. Being an entirely New and Unabridged Issue. London: Watts & Co. 1906.

the daughter of Bradlaugh. As she truly says, "as long as men love liberty and earnest straightforward speech, so long will the words of Thomas Paine be read." The task has naturally been to Mrs. Bonner a labour of love.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

A Short History of Wales,[1] by Mr. Owen Edwards, will be found useful and interesting by such as have not time to study the subject in *The Story of Wales* by the same author, or in *The Welsh People* by Rhys and Brynmor-Jones. Mr. Edwards points out very pertinently that far more important to Wales than the Reform Acts are the Local Government Acts which followed them. "With a great difference, it is true, Wales under Local Government is Wales back again in the times of the princes. The parish is roughly the maenol, the district is the commote or the cantar; the shire is the little kingdom—like Ceardigion or Morganniog—which fought so sturdily against any attempt to subject it." There is in the appendix a good synopsis of Welsh political history, six genealogical tables, and several maps.

There are many histories of India, but all of them are open to some objection: are too bulky; have grown obsolete owing to the discovery of new matter, or are inadequate for the purposes of the student. *History of India from the Earliest Times to the End of the Nineteenth Century*,[2] now in a new and revised edition, is open to none of these objections. Its author, Mr. H. G. Keene, who comes from a family long associated with India, has had considerable experience as an examiner, and, therefore, knows that candidates for the Civil Service require a work which relates the whole growth of India from Chaos to Cosmos, in a consecutive order, and mentions operative facts, yet not dwelling too minutely on the details of battles, sieges, or the intrigues and crimes of high-placed men. The chronological analysis begins with the Invasion of India by Mahmud of Ghazni in 1008 and ends with the retirement, in 1899, of Lord Elgin in favour of Lord Curzon of Keddleston. The result of this long and eventful story is to show that the Hindus are an ancient people who have preserved some of the characteristics of primitive civilisation whilst they have been comparatively indifferent

1 *A Short History of Wales.* By Owen Edwards. London: T. Fisher Unwin.
2 *History of India from the Earliest Times to the End of the Nineteenth Century.* By H. G. Keene, C.I.E. Two vols. Edinburgh: John Grant.

to the form under which they have been ruled. New ideals have been recently introduced, but time alone can show whether the new order, still regarded as a matter of conjecture and controversy, will prove successful. The appendix on the genesis of the first Afghan War forms perhaps the most interesting chapter in the book.

Lectures on Modern History,[1] by the late Lord Acton, and edited, with a very sympathetic introduction, by Messrs. J. N. Figgis and R. V. Lawrence, remain the chief but not only important literary record of a profound thinker, a scholar of encyclopædic range, and in addition an engaging personality. Another volume, embodying his lectures on the French Revolution, is about to be issued. Short as was the tenure of his Chair, he, nevertheless, left behind in Cambridge an abiding monument of his zeal for his favourite study in the foundation of the Trinity Historical Society, and above all, in planning out the "Cambridge Modern History" series. His hypothesis that a law of moral progress governs the world is disputable, but of its nobility there can be no doubt. Hence his insistence on the spiritual element in history, from which alone its dignity is derived. The nineteen chapters of the work before us treat of the beginnings of the modern State and deal with the most important epochs of European history down to the American Revolution.

Prior to the publication of *The Jungle*, it has been too much the fashion among writers who have visited the United States to view that country through rose-coloured spectacles. This charge, however, cannot be brought against M. George Moreau, whose *L'Envers des États-Unis*[2] is the gravest indictment yet penned against the crudities of a civilisation based on material wealth. Uncle Sam is *un grand goguenard, bonhomme, très actif, vantard et ignorant, menacé par l'alcoolisme et le sang noir, et devant crever de pléthora ou succomber encore jeune, accablé par les maladies du viel âge.* His womenfolk are *cabotines*. Only the Chicago scandals seem to have escaped M. Moreau's malevolent eyes. He sees signs of instability in the present loose federation of the States themselves, and believes that a day will come when the great and prosperous States will fight in defence of their private interests, and seek alliance with the small and less prosperous ones. Whether we endorse his views or not, M. Moreau, it must be admitted, has produced a decidedly stimulative book.

[1] *Lectures on Modern History.* By Lord Acton, D.C.L., L.L.D., &c. Edited, with an Introduction, by John Neville Figgis, M.A., and Reginald Vere Lawrence, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co

[2] *L'Envers des Etats-Unis.* Par George Moreau. Paris: Librairie-Plon.

THE DRAMA.

Mr. A. F. Watt's edition of *Shakespeare: A Midsummer Night's Dream*,[1] though primarily designed for candidates for the forthcoming Teacher's Certificate Examination, may be commended to the notice of all who wish to study that masque intelligently. The introduction contains a very clear exposition of the metre, and also a brief but adequate section on Shakespeare's fairy-world. The notes, too, leave nothing to be desired; they are short, scholarly, and evade no textual difficulties.

BELLES LETTRES.

The King's Guerdon,[2] by Mr. James Blyth, chronicles a wonderful year in the life of Richard Cuddon, a Norfolk farmer, and owner of a brig that served as a privateer what time the Dutch made descents on our eastern coast, and the plague raged in London. Pepys, the Duke of York, and even Charles II. himself, play their part in this breezy and fascinating novel, on which the author deserves congratulation. The brig and its gallant crew turn the tide of battle, save fair Joyce Surtees from the clutches of a plague-stricken madman, and bring the hero his heart's desire and a goodly estate.

So far as we are aware, Finland, in spite of its charming scenery and hospitable people, has hitherto been little visited by the British tourist, and still less noticed by writers in search of material for fiction. In *The Patriots*,[3] however, Mr. Fred Wishaw, who has given us many stories dealing with Russian life history, again turns to account his extensive knowledge of Northern Europe. This time he has chosen for his subject the "land of a thousand lakes," when that country was seething with discontent on account of the ukase that had abolished its Constitution. Among the patriots none was more "Finnophil" than beautiful Ebba Harlsen, whose father had been spirited away, presumably to Siberia, from his quiet parsonage for having taken a prominent part in obtaining signatures to the Great Petition. Both she and her younger sister, Svenda, to whom politics are all but indifferent, are for a time attracted by

[1] *Shakespeare: A Midsummer Night's Dream.* Edited by A. F. Watt, M.A. Oxon., B.A. Lond. London: W. B. Clive.
[2] *The King's Guerdon.* By James Blyth. London: Digby, Long & Co.
[3] *The Patriots.* By Fred Wishaw. London: Digby, Long & Co.

Russians—Ebba to the Russian Governor's son, who assumes, to ingratiate himself with her, a Swedish name; Svenda to an amateur *agent provocateur*, whose social eccentricities lead to his downfall. It is a pretty and pathetic story, abounding with good descriptions of scenery, and exciting episodes portraying the demoralising influence of oppression on the rank and file of the oppressed.

London University Guide and University Correspondence College Calendar, 1907,[1] contains the regulations for examinations to be held in this and the following year. This valuable publication, which may be obtained *gratis*, should be in the hands of all candidates for London degrees, for the vast amount of valuable advice and information it affords is not to be found elsewhere. During the last twelve years University Correspondence College, with its annually increasing staff of specialists, has scored no less than 10,478 successes at the London University. Comment is unnecessary: these figures speak for themselves.

English, notwithstanding the comparative simplicity of its grammar, is by no means an easy language to write correctly; Americanisms and the jargon affected by the so-called "yellow press" are not the only or most dangerous pitfalls against which writers ought to be on their guard. *The King's English*,[2] compiled by H. W. F. and F. G. F., may be regarded as a supplement to the grammars in common use. The principle its authors adopted has been (1) to pass by all rules, of whatever absolute importance, that are shown by observation to be seldom or never broken; and (2) to illustrate by living examples all blunders that observation shows to be common. A very full index obviates any inconvenience in this apparent rejection of method. Nearly all our leading authors are occasionally guilty of lapses from grammatical propriety, and it is from their writings, as well as from newspapers, that examples of such lapses have been collected for illustrating this work, the value of which it would be hard to over-estimate. A long chapter is devoted to the difficult art of punctuation.

In *The Soul of a Woman*,[3] Miss (?) Barbara Glynn seems to have kept before her mind's eye Jean Paul's saying: "Place moral heroes in the field, and heroines will follow them." Veronica's heroism jeopardised her own happiness as well as her hero's, and all for the sake of a sister whom she knew to be worthless. The author labours under the impression that the "Deceased Wife's Sister's Bill," periodically rejected by the House of Commons, has become law.

In *Silas Strong*,[4] Mr. Irving Bacheller has given us a story that

[1] *London University Guide and University Correspondence College Calendar, 1907.* London: University Correspondence College.

[2] *The King's English.* Second Edition. By H. W. F. and F. G. F. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

[3] *The Soul of a Woman.* By Barbara Glynn. London: Digby, Long & Co.

[4] *Silas Strong.* By Irving Bacheller. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

will not lose by comparison with *Eben Holden*, of which 393,000 copies have already been sold. Silas Strong is a hunter and trapper, skilful with rod as with gun, and hailed by all the trappers of the Adirondacks as "Emperor" of the woods. He is a shy, taciturn man who lives with his sister—a kind, motherly woman—in a log hut. Without any warning, this singular pair find themselves the temporary guardians of two ingenuous children, Socky and Sue, about the time that this rural solitude is invaded by rival candidates for Congress. The decree goes forth that the woods are to be felled. Masters, one of the candidates—a good fellow and thorough sportsman—falls in love with Edith Dunmore, whose father is a misanthropic poet. Their courtship, delicate but unconventional, constitutes the chief interest in this pathetic story, which is fragrant with the pine forests of the Adirondacks.

Like many other stories, tragic or containing certain tragic elements, *Disparu*,[1] by Breda, opens with a scene of idyllic beauty: in the mystic twilight of an early October evening two plighted lovers are voicing their dreams of happiness as they slowly pace the outskirts of a Norman village. A week hence they are to be made man and wife. Suddenly Geneviève feels a presentiment that if she lets Marcel leave her for a short visit to an aged relation, her marriage will be indefinitely postponed or never take place. In vain he tries to laugh away her fears, which, as the sequel shows, were justified. Months pass into years; Marcel has disappeared as completely as if the earth had opened and engulfed him. The author keeps his complex plot well in hand, and it is only in the final chapters that the mystery that had all but broken a girl's heart is dispelled. The subsidiary characters, especially the de Quienville and the shady firm of London solicitors, are well drawn.

ART.

The Vice-President of the Society of Portrait Painters publishes in a large volume three popular chapters on *The Art of Portrait Painting*,[2] its history, the aims and methods of the great Masters, and the practice of portrait painting. There are eight full-page colour plates after Millais, Sir Joshua Reynolds, Romney, Titian, Vandyke, Jan Van Eyck, and Whistler. The author says: "I was a little nervous about this (reproducing some of the pictures by the three-colour process), but I think the results have fully justified the step." The thirty-three other plates are in the customary

1 *Disparu*. Par Breda. Paris: Librairie-Plon.
2 *The Art of Portrait Painting*. By the Hon. John Collier. London: Cassell and Co. 1905.

half-tone. Besides being a pleasant book to look through, it introduces popularly and well to a knowledge of the branch of painting which has most human interest.

The Loan Collection of Portraits of English Historical Personages who died between 1714 and 1837, which was exhibited in the Examination Schools, Oxford, in April and May, 1906, is perpetuated in a handsome *Illustrated Catalogue*,[1] as had been done for the previous years. Besides its value as a work of historical reference, the introduction by Mr. Lionel Cust is of interest and importance in suitably placing art-work in the minds of all readers of their country's history and literature. There is no need of praising again the material work of the Clarendon Press; and a single example will show the profitable delight to be derived from the volume by the imaginative reader—the three portraits of the historian Gibbon reproduced in its pages. Wesley and Whitefield, Hartley and Priestley, and Young the poet are a few of the others, allowing us to "glimpse" the eighteenth century in the features of the men who gave it utterance.

In the series "The Makers of British Art," a volume has been devoted to the sea-painter, *Henry Moore*.[2] The book is very complete, and well-illustrated with twenty-one plates after the originals, the photographic process catching faithfully the lines of wave movement from the paintings. The interest of the book is not limited to its immediate subject, although that is considerable. Henry was an instance of heredity, his father being a portrait painter of York, his mother guilty of drawing, while five out of the fourteen children went in for Art professionally. The youngest was Albert Moore, whom the Royal Academy, but not the world, refused to recognise. The author goes into the history of sea-painting in England rather extensively, both before and after Henry Moore, whose works are minutely catalogued in the appendix.

A volume of 125 pages, with eight reproductions in colour and thirty-two other illustrations, has been written on the well-known painters and teachers, Mr. and Mrs. Stanhope Forbes.[3] Mr. Forbes, coming of a family of art patrons, and with an artistic upbringing largely in France and Belgium, found in Brittany, where he painted sedulously, the consort of his lifework—an English artist like himself. The story is pleasant reading—with the pictures to vouch for it.

[1] *Illustrated Catalogue of a Loan Collection of Portraits of English Historical Personages (1714–1837).* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

[2] *Henry Moore, R.A.* By Frank Maclean. London: The Walter Scott Publishing Co. 1905.

[3] *Stanhope A. Forbes, A.R.A., and Elizabeth Stanhope Forbes, A.R.W.S.* By Mrs. Lionel Birch. London: Cassell & Co. 1906.

THE

WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

VOL. CLXVI. No. 6.—DECEMBER 1906.

THE COMMERCE OF LITERATURE.

MORE than half a century has passed since the last great convulsion in connection with the commerce of literature shook the publishers and booksellers of this country. Despite the compact majority, the minority, being in the right, prevailed. In the fight of 1852 for free trade in literature, the WESTMINSTER REVIEW was in the forefront of the forces on the side of progress, and to-day the WESTMINSTER REVIEW stands exactly as it did fifty-four years ago, and we cannot do better than quote the following from the exhaustive article which appeared in our issue for April 1852.

The facts connected with the production and distribution of books, though little heeded by the public, are, nevertheless, of great social and political, as well as literary, importance. Wherever our empire extends, Englishmen are wont to point with pride to the freedom and power of the Press, but neither the one nor the other is such as to warrant our self-gratulation, if we consider what it might be, or even what exists beyond the Atlantic. We believe that the informing and elevating power which the printing-press and steam-engine have already placed at our command is insignificant compared with that which these mighty agencies will confer when the obstacles that now impede their full development shall have been removed. In the hope of hastening their removal, we shall endeavour in this article to exhibit the direct and collateral causes of a fiscal and commercial character, inimical to the progress and diffusion of literature in the British Isles.

The cost of "setting up" the type, or the "composition," as it is called, and of printing-off the impressions of a work, forms a large

proportion of the whole expense of production, when the edition is a small one; but when works are printed in "long numbers"—say 20,000 or 50,000 copies—the cost of "composition" being spread over the whole edition, is much less important even than that of press-work, or "machining"—that is, printing by steam.

It has, we believe, always been the practice of publishers, unlike the manufacturers of nearly all other articles of commerce, to fix and advertise the price at which their publication should be sold. There are urgent reasons why this exceptional system should be continued in respect to books, because, unless the public be made aware of the price of each work advertised, purchasers would be constantly liable to such surprise and vexation, consequent on its proving greater than anticipated, that they would hesitate to give orders involving them in responsibilities the extent of which they could not foresee. Persons may readily conjecture the probable difference in price between calico and linen, linen and worsted, worsted and silk, or silk and velvet; but the titles of two books, selling respectively at five shillings and five pounds, do not necessarily contain any indications of their relative values. These considerations, we presume, originated the plan of advertising the price of each publication. This being determined upon, another question immediately followed, viz., how shall the agent for the distribution of books be remunerated for his risk and labour? Two modes would naturally occur—either he might charge a commission to his customer on the advertised price, or he might supply him without, and depend for his profit on a discount to be obtained from the publisher. The latter mode was the one adopted, and has been the parent of innumerable conflicts and trouble (not yet ended) in the book-selling world. The nominal discount allowed to the trade—*i.e.*, by the publisher to the bookseller is twenty-five per cent.; moreover, twenty-five copies are charged as twenty-four, and in cases of low-priced books, thirteen as twelve, or seven as six and a half.

A narrow and ignorant policy has aggravated the fiscal obstacles to cheap literature. The trade itself lends its organised assistance to increase their rigour; so that of literature it may with truth be said, "its greatest foes are those of its own household." Obstacles from without may have the virtue of stimulating activity by the resistance they create; but those from within, working at the very centre of action, must inevitably entail partial paralysis upon the system. Such, we believe, have been the effects of that unwise policy adhered to by the booksellers.

We shall carry the reader as far back as 1774, and introduce him to a Methodist shoemaker, who opened a small shop in a back street with a stock-in-trade of a few Methodist books and magazines, which constituted his "private library," and a bag full of old divinity

which he purchased from a "holy brother lately gone to heaven." This was the famous James Lackington, "who, a few years back"—so runs the superscription on the effigy which adorns his "Memoirs"—"began business with £5, and now sells 100,000 volumes annually." From his humble commencement, Lackington persevered and prospered, till he was deemed sufficiently "respectable" to be invited to the trade sales, where he was initiated into a mode of doing business which suggested to him the plan he afterwards adopted, and with which his name is indelibly associated.

"When first invited," he says, "to these trade sales, I was very much surprised to learn, that it was common for such as purchased 'remainders' to destroy one-half or three-fourths of such books, and to charge the full publication price, or nearly that, for such as they kept on hand; and there was a kind of standing order amongst the trade, that, in case any one was known to sell articles under the publication price, such a person was to be excluded from trade sales; so blind were copyright-holders to their own interest. For a short time I cautiously complied with this custom, but I soon began to reflect that many of these books, so destroyed, possessed much merit, and only wanted to be better known; and that if others were not worth six shillings, they were worth three, or two, and so on in proportion for higher or lower priced books. From that time I resolved not to destroy any books that were worth saving, but to sell them off at half or quarter of the publication prices. This part of my conduct, however, though evidently highly beneficial to the community, and even to booksellers, created me many enemies among the trade; some of the meaner part of whom, instead of employing their time and abilities in attending to the increase of their own business, aimed at reducing mine; and by a variety of pitiful insinuations and dark inuendoes, strained every nerve to injure the reputation I had already acquired with the public, determined (as they wisely concluded) thus to effect my ruin; which, indeed, they daily prognosticated with demon-like spirit, must inevitably very speedily follow. This conduct, however, was far from intimidating me, as the effect proved directly opposite to what they wished for and expected. . . . I am still enlarging my business every year, and the more it is extended, the cheaper I can afford to sell; so that though I may be pursued, I cannot be overtaken, except I should (as some others have done) be so infatuated and blinded by prosperity, as to think that the public would continue their favours, even though the plan of business were reversed. But, as the King of Bohemia kept his country shoes by him to remind him of whence he was taken, I have put a motto on the doors of my carriage, constantly to remind me to what I am indebted for my prosperity, viz., 'Small profits do great things.'"

He then goes on to refute the charge of injuring other booksellers by his cheap system, observing that he has as much reason to complain of them for giving credit as they of him for "selling cheap and giving no credit," credit being as great an inducement to many a purchaser as cheapness; and that as an equivalent for refusing the one, he both can give and ought to have the other. The case could not be more clearly stated than is thus done by Lackington, and is applicable to present circumstances as if it had been written yesterday. Sceptical of the soundness of the principle, or of the

possible success of the plan pursued by the spirited bibliopole, the trade in 1806 formed a combination with the view of extinguishing him; but it was doomed to be itself extinguished by his pointed arguments, withering sarcasm, and above all, by the great fact of his ever-increasing success. Lackington was the first "cheap bookseller," and no sooner did the public begin to speak about "cheap books" than the "Booksellers' Association" was called into being —an origin sufficiently indicative of its object.

It seems to us that the radical vice of English publishing consists in the low prices at which books are sold to the trade compared with those at which they are advertised to the public. If this difference were diminished at least one half, the combination which has occupied so much of our attention would inevitably be broken up. It is probable that such large discounts were essential when the facilites of transit and communication were small compared with those now established, but the revolution effected by Watt, Stephenson, and Rowland Hill, necessitates a corresponding change in the rules and practices of business, and especially in those exceptional ones peculiar to the distribution of books. We doubt not the experienced men of the trade could devise a remedy for existing evils, were they intent on re-adjusting their arrangements conformably to the new conditions and demands of the time; but we would venture to suggest—if the old (wrong) principle of allowing a discount from the published price be retained, that when a reform is effected, the rules of its application should be so far modified as to permit of a diminution of discount, up to a certain point, in proportion as the price of books increases. It is especially desirable that booksellers should be induced to take an interest in low-priced books, by obtaining a greater proportionate profit upon them, because of the great comparative cost and difficulty (as already explained) of making them known by means of advertising. Of course, in any case, the absolute profit would be less than on larger works. We would also suggest that the discounts fixed upon should not be allowed unless a certain number of copies of a work be purchased, which is the only condition constituting a claim to that advantage.

But the regular bookselling system can only be dealt with by the large body of authors whom it intimately concerns, and by the powerful voice of public opinion. We are glad of it. Government is not swift to destroy abuses; but when the intelligence of the people is arrayed against them, their doom is already pronounced. Under any circumstance whatever system of discount or no discount to the trade be adopted, it is futile to devise an artificial remedy for those assumed evils which grow inevitably out of the relative conditions of men, and the nature of things.

THE PEERS *v* THE PEOPLE.

At the behest of the Archbishop of Canterbury and such Anglo-Catholic and Roman Catholic peers as Lord Halifax and the Duke of Norfolk, the House of Lords is engaged in the congenial task of turning the Education Bill both upside down and inside out. At the General Election the people of this country declared emphatically (1) that all schools in receipt of public funds shall be subject to direct public control, and (2) that there shall be no sectarian tests for teachers; and these principles were, though in somewhat halting fashion, embodied in Mr. Birrell's measure. The Bill as it left the Commons was the minimum that the Nonconformists would accept, and, in "extended facilities" and suchlike, it gave the maximum to the Church. But the peers and the prelates, not content with this, have carved and hacked at the measure until it is absolutely unrecognisable, until, in fact, it is far more clerical and anti-popular than Mr. Balfour's Bill of 1902. This the Bishop of Manchester guilelessly terms "a process of reconstitution!" But, as Mr. Asquith forcibly put it at the Manchester Reform Club,[1] "Suppose I were to take the Ten Commandments, and to write the word 'not' in those of them which are affirmative, and to omit the word 'not' from those of them which are prohibitive, would the Bishop call that a 'reconstitution' of the Decalogue?"

However, we may yet have cause to thank the Bishop of Manchester for his phrase, just as we may yet have cause to thank the bishops and the lords for their ill-advised flouting of the popular will. Their insensate folly may well lead to a radical "reconstitution" of the Education Bill on the just and logical lines of what is known as "the secular solution," and to the re-establishment of *ad hoc* educational authorities. Their attempt to establish and endow sectarian education has undoubtedly given a great fillip to the movement in favour of that "process of reconstitution" known as the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church; and it may well result in a very similar "process of reconstitution," the disestablishment and disendowment of the House of Lords itself. This is "a consummation most devoutly to be wished;" and, if their lordships only have the temerity to deal in the same fashion with the other important measures which have yet to come before them—the Trades' Disputes Bill, the Workmen's Compensation Bill, the

[1] November 2.

Merchant Shipping Bill, the Plural Voting Bill, the Scottish Land Bill, and the English Land Tenure Bill, the long outstanding account between the peers and the people may very shortly be in process of settlement.

Nor, if the Liberal Party is thoroughly in earnest and "means business," should this be a very difficult task. It is true that Mr. Balfour has assured us that the House of Lords "stands impregnable, not merely upon its historic past, but upon its present utility."[1] And this may be the one "settled conviction" remaining to him; but similar "settled convictions" in regard to his late Administration, and in regard to his hold on East Manchester, were very rudely unsettled, and a like fate awaits him in the present instance. As has been repeatedly pointed out, the weak point in the defences of the House of Lords is their impotence in regard to matters of finance, and this has been illustrated once more during the Education Bill debate in the Non-representative Chamber. The Primate had been "pleading for support for an amendment . . . to make the so-called confiscation of denominational schools compulsory on local authorities at the bidding of school-owners," when Lord Stanley of Alderley bluntly interposed. "Is the Primate not aware," he asked, "that his proposal would impose a heavy obligation on the rates? Does he wish to expose us to a rebuff from the other House for going beyond our constitutional rights?" "The shrewd thrust caused a great commotion," says the *Manchester Guardian's* Parliamentary correspondent.[2] "'No, no,' shouted the indignant Unionists. 'What?' cried Lord Stanley, 'does any one deny that we have no power to initiate legislation involving an addition to the rates?' This time the challenge was sullenly ignored. Moreover, it continued to be ignored, though, as the subsequent confusion showed, it lingered in the minds of all, and indeed led to the ultimate collapse of the debate."

A "shrewd thrust" on matters financial may well "cause a great commotion" in the House of Lords, for it may well be a shrewd financial thrust that will cause "the ultimate collapse" of this house of cards that Mr. Balfour deems, forsooth, "impregnable."

Finance is the "Achilles' heel" of the House of Lords. The Upper Chamber has been abolished once, in the days of the Commonwealth, and what man has done man can do. Nor to make a clean sweep is there any need to "send 500 sweeps to the Lords." The Maories, the aborigines of New Zealand, put their Lords on one meal a day until they approve measures passed by the Maori "House of Commons"—a rough and ready and withal very effective method of bringing them to reason. Unfortunately, we cannot reach the members of our House of Lords through their stomachs, but we can reach them through their pockets, and the

[1] Manchester, October 22. [2] October 31.

pocket is a very sensitive organ. Let the House of Commons pass a one-clause Bill, "that the House of Lords, being both useless and dangerous, ought to be and is hereby abolished." The Lords would doubtless reject the measure, In that case let the Commons tack on to it a tax of 1d. in the £ on land values, and send it up once more. The Bill might be again rejected, but the tax on land values would go through, and, as they would say in America, it would hit the House of Landlords "where they live." If the Bill comes back to the Commons again, make the tax on land values 2d. in the £; next time, 4d.; next time, 8d.; and I will guarantee that long before the tax reaches 20s. in £ their landlordships will give way. They would rather be disestablished than disendowed.

And the Tories themselves are kindly instructing the people as to what they shall substitute for the House of Lords when once the career of this constitutional anachronism has been ended. Speaking at Perth on October 5 last Lord Lansdowne claimed that "in grave cases the House of Lords may ask the country to judge between it and the Commons." "This," as the *Tribune* pointed out,[1] "is as much as to say that whenever a Liberal Government is in power the Lords may use any first-class measure as a means of forcing a dissolution." But, added the *Tribune*, "the country will never stand these claims . . . If the country is to pronounce on every great measure individually, it can only do so by means of a referendum, and, if Lord Lansdowne seriously considered the trend of his argument, he would see that this is the conclusion to which it leads."

Lord Hugh Cecil's utterance on the question at Preston on November 6 points in the same direction: "A great effort was being made, he said, to intimidate the House of Lords, which was charged with acting at variance with the verdict of the people. No fair-minded Liberal would affirm that if the late election had been fought solely on the education question the Liberal majority would have been so great as to enable the Government to act independently of the Irish vote, and carry this Bill, with its extravagant disregard of the claims of Churchmen and Roman Catholics, through the country. Therefore it was the duty of the Second Chamber to give effect to what would, in its opinion, be the judgment of the electorate, if consulted."

Again, Lord Avebury, speaking in the House of Lords on October 23, declared that "if the Education Bill were referred to a referendum vote, many doubted whether it would be carried."

While, in the speech we have already quoted, Mr. Balfour told the Manchester Conservative Club that "if we were to try to work in this country by one Chamber, we should have to introduce into our Constitution something like the Swiss plebiscite, and so refer

[1] October 6.

every legislative project after it had passed to the arbitrament of the community at large before it became law."

The referendum is the true alternative to the House of Lords. And it is very certain that if the Education Bill of 1902 had been submitted to a referendum it would never have become law. The Duke of Devonshire himself admitted as much when he said that if a general election had taken place when the measure was before the country it would never have been passed. It is even more certain that a plebiscite would not result in favour of the present Bill as "amended" by the House of Lords. And any doubt, if doubt there be, as to whether Mr. Birrell's measure as it passed the Commons would be approved by the electorate, exists only because the Bill is not radical enough, and because too many concessions have been made to clericalism.

Further, in addition to having the right of veto upon legislation passed by the House of Commons, the electors should have the right to initiate legislation by means of what is known as the "initiative," or "initiatory mandate." The "initiative" and the referendum together constitute what is termed "direct legislation," and it is this form of legislation that has been applied with such success in several American cities to get rid of "boss" rule and to secure the municipalisation of gas, water, tramways, electric light, and other natural monopolies, the control of which by private companies has been largely responsible for the gross corruption in connection with municipal politics in the United States. This form of legislation has also been applied in New Zealand in the case of the Rating on Unimproved (Land) Values Act. The Act is an adoptive measure, and is brought into play by means of the initiative. If a certain percentage of the electorate in any district petition the local authority of that district in favour of the adoption of the Act, the petition is a mandate to the local authority to take a poll of the electors upon the question, and if this plebiscite results in favour of the adoption of the Act the local authority must put it in force forthwith. In this way upwards of 70 local authorities have been called upon to adopt the rating of land values; and in not a few cases it has happened that local bodies comprising a majority of landholders, and therefore opposed to this reform, have by means of the initiative and referendum been compelled to rate land values.

Had the people of this country enjoyed such powers during the late Tory *régime*, there can be little doubt that a strongly-signed petition or "initiatory mandate" would have compelled Mr. Balfour's Government to right the Taff Vale decision as soon as it was pronounced.

The referendum and the initiative would go far to secure the political ideal of a free country—government of the people by the people, for the people. But before our legislative machinery can be con-

sidered thoroughly democratised, the procedure of the House of Commons must be drastically amended and brought up to date, and for the present system of government by party there must be substituted the elective executive system which obtains in the Swiss Cantons. The Cabinet must be elected by the House of Commons, and must have executive functions only. All legislation must be initiated, not by the Executive, but by private members, the Executive simply carrying out the instructions of the House in regard to the drafting of measures approved in principle by the House. Under such a system the existence of the Executive would not be imperilled by the amendment or the rejection of any measure. All measures would therefore be debated on and voted upon on their merits, and no member would be constrained to vote against his principles or his pledges in order to keep his party in power, and the old game of "see-saw" and of "how not to do it" would be for ever at an end.

Of course it will take time to thoroughly democratise such an old institution as "the British Constitution"; but the present action of the House of Lords renders the democratisation of our Constitution imperative, at least so far as the anomalous position of this Chamber of Hereditary Wreckers is concerned, and I trust that the Liberal Party will take the matter energetically in hand.

An appeal to the people against the peers will no doubt be necessary, but it would be a great mistake, perhaps a fatal mistake, to appeal to the country on the lords' action in regard to the Education Bill alone. Other Radical measures must be sent up to their lordships, and they must be given every opportunity to put themselves on record in opposition to the will of the people. Further, by carrying in the teeth of their lordships financial reforms, such as a Bill empowering local bodies to rate land values, and a Budget embracing Payment of Members and of Election Expenses, Old Age Pensions, the Abolition of the Breakfast-Table Duties, &c., the Government must "get up steam" for the final conflict with the House of Lords. May that conflict come soon!

A. W.

THE MONTH.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

The Importance of being Earnest.

It is more than probable that the House of Lords is using the Education Bill "as a means of forcing a dissolution." And, though Mr. Balfour, fearing no doubt lest he may absolutely antagonise Labour, has given a strong hint that the Lords are to let the Trades Disputes Bill pass, there is every probability that other first-class measures will be either mutilated or rejected with a view to forcing an appeal to the country. Already Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Winston Churchill have warned us that we may be in the throes of a General Election much sooner than is generally anticipated. But it is to be hoped that before they appeal to the country the Government will heap up to the full the cup of iniquity of the House of Lords, sending up measure after measure to be mangled and rejected. And we trust that one of the measures so sent up will be a Referendum Bill, so that the issue as to whether the Lords or the people are to rule may be as clear as possible. We further trust that concurrently with this process of "filling up the cup," the Government will establish beyond the shadow of a doubt their own good faith and earnestness of purpose in the only way atth is open to them, that is to say, by carrying, in the teeth of the Lords, as they can if they will, a series of vital and far-reaching financial reforms. As Mr. Asquith said at Manchester, "It was not merely for defensive purposes that the electorate entrusted the present Liberal Government with an unprecedented Parliamentary majority." It was not merely to "mark time," to "fill up the cup," or "to plough the sands," that they were returned to power. but the elections had "supplied distinct, overwhelming evidence of a desire and demand on the part of the people of this country that Parliament, setting aside the trifling and dilettantism of the last ten years, should grapple and grapple earnestly with our great social and industrial problems—problems, for instance, to enumerate one or two out of what might be a long list, such as those connected with education, with temperance, with the right of combination, with the growth of expenditure, with the incidence of local and national taxation."

However earnestly the Government may grapple with such questions as education, temperance, and the right of combination, the House of Lords can render their best efforts null and void. But in regard to retrenchment and the incidence of local and national taxation that irresponsible Chamber of Hereditary Wreckers is powerless, and it therefore behoves the Government to prove themselves worthy of the great trust reposed in them by grappling right earnestly with financial reform. It was not without good reason that Mr. Asquith warned the Manchester Reform Club to "see that you keep the ground you have won." It was not without good reason that he warned them that "it is not because we have achieved for Free Trade a signal and seemingly a decisive victory that we can safely lock up our weapons, fold our hands, and go quietly to sleep. The fallacy, or rather the bundle of fallacies, which we call Protection is one of that class of human errors which, though they are killed by argument, have an awkward knack of rising again from the dead." But if Protection does rise again from the dead, it will simply be because the Liberal party choses to adopt on this question a merely defensive attitude. As Mrs. Cobden Unwin, a daughter of Richard Cobden, declared at the Essex Hall, London, on January 9, 1905, recalling, no doubt, a famous utterance of her father:[1] "If the liberation of the land had been properly taken in hand, this battle for Free Trade would not have to be fought." And, if the present Liberal Government will only take advantage of their golden opportunity and see that the liberation of the land is properly taken in hand, we shall not again have to fight for Free Trade. But if the Government fail to do so, Protection will inevitably rise from the dead once more at the first serious recurrence of bad trade. The whole fight will have to be fought over again, and next time it may not result in a Free Trade victory. It rests very largely with Mr. Asquith himself, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, to determine the attitude of the Government on this matter, for the liberation of the land can best be accomplished through the Budget by the taxation of land values.

Is Mr. Asquith in Earnest?

The Premier, we believe, is thoroughly sound on this question. Replying the other day[2] to a deputation of more than 100 Members of Parliament who waited on him "to urge the need of Government legislation on the subject of small holdings," Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman "reminded the deputation that not only on

"C.-B." and Lloyd-George.

[1] "You who shall liberate the land will do more for your country than we have done in the liberation of its commerce."—Rochdale, 1864.

[2] *Daily News*, Nov. 7, 1906.

that occasion, but in nearly every speech he had made for many years past, he had expressly referred to the urgency of this question"—the question as he termed it on another occasion, of "colonising our own country," the question of "making the land less the pleasure ground of the rich and more the treasure house of the nation." And Mr. Lloyd George, replying at Rochester to Mr. Austen Chamberlain's recent "Tariff Reform" speech at Canterbury, hit the nail fairly and squarely on the head. "The Liberal Party," he said, "had given the people Free Trade, and they would give them free land." "We will complete the tale that was begun by Cobden and Bright," he declared amid resounding cheers; "we will not repudiate it." We would that every Member of the Ministry and of the Party realised as keenly as does Mr. Lloyd George how serious a testing time it is that the Liberal Party is now passing through, and how absolutely necessary it is not only that the Party should be in earnest but also that it should convince the country that it is in earnest. "Liberalism," he declared on October 21, "was on the morrow of the greatest triumph of two or three generations, it was also on the eve of its greatest trial. In the old days everything was governed by the swing of the pendulum, but, unless he was mistaken, the political clock was not to be worked any longer on the pendulum principle. The people were beginning to say, 'here you have been tinkering for generations with reform, and the end of it all is slums, pauperism, and great want in a land of plenty.' They turned to the British political parties and said, 'If you are in earnest you are bunglers; if you are not in earnest, then you are rogues.' If that state of things were not remedied it would mean the end of the old political parties. The answer rested with Liberalism during the next three years. Up to 1885 two-thirds of the advanced Liberals of the country had no votes. There was no driving force to send the party along, and since then they had not had their chance. He would not examine the causes too closely, but the people preferred to trust another party. For twenty years the Unionists had had their chance with a great popular force behind them, and they had done nothing in the right direction. The result was that the people had turned from them in disgust. If Liberalism failed to take this chance, in his opinion it would be the last, for they would turn to other organisations. He believed they had done with Toryism. They had left it behind. The whole future of the Liberal Party depended upon the practical answer they gave to the expectations of the people. If Liberalism was not afraid of its task, if it was not frightened by the prospect of obstacles, if it was not too readily fatigued with the effort to surmount them, then he believed its future was assured. But Liberalism would prosper only as long as it inspired hope in the young, confidence in the mature, gratitude in the old, and faith in all."

The One Test of Good Faith.

The Goverment cannot firmly establish its *bona fides* except by including in next year's Budget a substantial tax on land values, and by empowering local authorities to rate land values. And, as an earnest of its good faith, and a preparation for such taxation, it should carry during the present session a short Bill providing for an up-to-date assessment of land values as apart from improvements. In this connection, we cannot but regard it as a somewhat sinister fact that Mr. Asquith should have set up a Special Committee, now about to report, to consider the question of the graduation and the differentiation of the Income-Tax. Still more sinister is the fact that the *Daily News*, the self-styled "National Liberal Organ," in a series of articles headed "To Colonise England," has throughout given prominence to unjust and impraticable land purchase proposals, and has almost entirely ignored the just and practicable method which the Premier has untiringly advocated, and to which the party is pledged to the hilt, namely, the taxation of land values. This, though the *Daily News* itself declared some months ago,[1] under the heading "The Tax that Cures," "A tax on land values is unique among fiscal experiments in that it frees industry instead of restricting it. It attacks the corner in land, which, after all is the most pernicious and far-reaching corner that has ever been held . . . There could be but one result of an honest fiscal enquiry, and that would be to tax land values. By freeing land it would promote industry and lessen employment. The tax," added the leader writer, "has been imposed with every success in New Zealand and the Australian Colonies." But while on October 1st last, the *Daily News* announced that "The supreme problem of our time is to bring the landless man and the manless land into contact. We believe that this is the chief task of the Liberal Government, and it is to forward that work that we open our columns to-day for serious consideration of the measure to be adopted," the striking object-lessons from our Colonies as to the success of the taxation of land values in "bringing the landless man and the manless land into contact" were throughout ignored.

Land Purchase a Costly Failure.

The abundant evidence as to the failure of land purchase was also entirely ignored, though only the previous month[2] the *Daily News*, dealing with the report of the Irish Estates Commissioners, had shown that the Tory Irish Land Purchase Bill had increased by 68·5 per cent. the price per acre received by the landlords, and had declared that "The landlords are not alone clearing out with the £12,000,000 as bonus, but with a much larger sum for which

1 July 20, 1905. 2 September 24, 1906.

there is no adequate security, and which will hang as a millstone around the necks of thousands and thousands of small purchasers, their children and their grandchildren. "This," comments *Land Values*,[1] "should make interesting reading for those land reformers, save the mark, who favour a policy they are pleased to name a system of land purchase for rural England and Scotland, with a view to a just and final settlement of the people on the land. Rational and fair-minded people will regard this report of the Irish scheme rather in the light of an exposure of a bad principle, that in the end brings failure and despair, imposing a condition of slave-labour on children yet unborn. The only people who gain by such a policy are the landlords, and their gain is at the expense of the new land-holders and the public, while the land question remains as of old to torment the public and amuse the cynic. All this comes of doing things in a hurry, and by taking as counsellors the politicians who mistake motion for progress." And *Land Values* quotes from the *Glasgow Herald*, of September 24th last, an instructive comparison as to the respective cost of land purchase and non-purchase settlements effected by the Scottish Congested District Boards. In the cases of Dunbeath and Sollas and Grenitole, the total cost of settling each family under non-purchase schemes was £23 and £71 respectively. While under land purchase at Lyne and at Bora the total outlay per family was £203 and £803 respectively!

Daily News v. "C.-B."

Speaking at Leeds on March 19, 1903, the Prime Minister declared: "It may accurately be said that there is practically but one great impediment in the way of a sweeping improvement which would elevate the physical and moral welfare of the people. What is this? It is the interest and the overdue regard to the interest of the landowner and the political and social influence that he and his class can exercise, whether it be the slum owner extorting a preposterous compensation for tenements that ought to be indicted as public nuisances and removed at his expense, or whether it be the possessor of open land holding it up that he may gain the increment which the industry and energy of our people create. In these cases and all the classes and gradations of cases between them you have the public interest, and in antagonism with it the interest of the individual. You and I side with the public interest. Let the value of land be assessed independently of the buildings upon it, and upon such valuation let contribution be made to those public services which create the value. This is not to disturb the balance of equity, but to redress it. There is no unfairness in it. The unfairness is in the present state of things. Why should one man

[1] November 1906.

reap what another man sows? We would give to the landowner all that is his, but we would prevent him taking something which belongs to other people. Here you have, perhaps, the clearest example in present politics of the cardinal, abiding, and necessary difference between the Liberal Party and our opponents. It is here that lies the chasm yawning between us, athwart almost every public question." But the *Daily News*, apparently, has an "overdue regard to the interest of the landowner," and sides with the landholder's interest, and against the Premier and the public interest; and, while the *Daily News* is thus unfaithful in regard to the taxation of land values, while it boggles at "taking for the community what belongs to the community—the value that attaches to land by the growth of the community, while it would leave in the hands of individuals this value created by and therefore belonging to the public, this self-styled "National Liberal organ," which would seem to be qualifying as the National-Socialist organ, demands unceasingly that the State shall by means of a differentiated and stiffly-graduated income tax take from individual citizens what rightfully belongs to them!

The Better Way.

The policy of land purchase is not only expensive, but it is also ineffective and unnecessary. As Mr. Redmond is constantly reiterating, the Irish Land Purchase Act has absolutely failed to reinstate the evicted tenants. Mr. Redmond, it is true, advocates campulsory purchasing powers as the remedy, but the best method of applying compulsion is to levy a substantial tax on land values. Such a method not only costs the State nothing but, as a matter of fact, brings revenue into the public exchequer. Land purchase may be advocated by the *Daily News*, as by many others, under the mistaken impression that it is necessary to secure to the small holder the ownership of the land. But, as a matter of fact, fixity of tenure, security for improvements, and a reasonable rent are all that are required to induce people to go upon the land; and these the taxation of land values will secure. Says Mr. R. Winfrey, M.P., in a paper read before the Charity Organisation Society on December 12, 1904, speaking of the small holdings experiments at Spalding: "It will be observed that the County Council have put into operation *the letting* and not *the selling* clauses of the Small Holdings Act. We find that so long as tenants can be sure of fixity of tenure, they prefer to use all their capital to farm with." And naturally so. It is, in short, absolutely unnecessary to saddle either the State, the local authority, or the small holder with the cost of land purchase. Nor is a maze of Socialistic restrictions and regulations necessary. Mr. Winfrey says: "We did not see our way to adopt any Socialistic plan, or any elaborate co-operative system, good as many of those systems

are. We preferred not to over-burden the experiment with too many novelties; we simply found reliable working-men who knew their business, put them on the land under ordinary conditions and left them to work out their own salvation. We contend that by this simple experiment we have solved the problem: how to keep the best and most skilled of the agricultural population on the land." [1]

Sweating: Its Cause and Its Cure.

In regard to the "sweating" problem the *Daily News* would appear to be as hopelessly befogged as upon the land question. By its "Sweating Exhibition" in London, since followed up by similar exhibitions in Leicester and in Manchester, the *Daily News* has done very valuable work in calling attention to the evils of the "sweating" system, but when it comes to deal with the cause of and the cure for "sweating" it is utterly at sea. Equally at sea were practically all the speakers at the three days' conference recently held at the Guildhall, under the auspices of the National Anti-Sweating League. Mr. Sidney Webb, Mr. J. A. Hobson, and others dealt eloquently with what they are pleased to call "the economics of a minimum wage," but they failed to realise that a statutory minimum wage for the workers is valueless so long as the landlord is allowed to raise his rent and appropriate the whole of that wage above and beyond a bare subsistence. The Hon. W. Pember Reeves (High Commissioner for New Zealand) supported the demand for a minimum wage, but he forgot to tell those present at the conference that Mr. Tregear, the head of the New Zealand Labour Department, and the Hon. R. J. Seddon, the late Premier of New Zealand, had both been forced by the logic of events to admit that so far the minimum wage legislation of New Zealand has benefited one class only, and that the landlord class. To try, whether by charity, or by the abolition or the inspection of home labour, or by a minimum wage, to get rid of the evils of "sweating" without first putting an end to the unjust economic conditions which cause unemployment, and so keep the labour market in a constant state of overflow, is like trying to bale out with a small dipper a tank which a concealed pipe keeps constantly brimming over. And this, by-the-bye, is a recognised test for lunacy. If a person keeps on baling away without looking for the cause of the constant inflow of water it is a hopeless case. Only less hopeless is the case of the would-be social reformer who endeavours by aid of the dipper of charity, the dipper of State regulation and inspection, or the dipper of a minimum wage, to cure the great evils of the "sweating" system. Land monopoly is the cause of all the trouble. The land is fenced in, and labour is fenced out. Even Mr. G. Bernard Shaw,

[1] Speech at Rent Audit Supper at Spalding Corn Exchange.

Socialist though he is, has caught a glimpse of this fundamental truth. Speaking at the Caxton Hall, London, on June 28 last, he said: "The present social system produced a proletariat at one end and a proprietoriat at the other. The reason of this (he declared) was the present land system, which excluded large numbers from working on the land. These people were the proletariat, and had therefore to sell themselves in the market, and the competition amongst them for work was so great that they accepted any terms, even if the terms included lead poisoning," and he might have added "even if they included 'sweating' and worse." It is land monopoly that is responsible for the existence of so-called "surplus labour." It is land monopoly that causes the labour market to constantly overflow with unemployed. But, instead of seeking for the concealed pipe and turning off the tap, Mr. Shaw and his fellows bale away at the tank with their Socialistic tin dippers and great gusto!

"Children in Arms"!

To Mr. Haldane, with his ideal of "a nation in arms," succeeds Mr. Augustine Birrell with his "children in arms!" That rifle shooting should be taught in our elementary schools with the sanction of a Liberal Minister for education affords an astonishing commentary upon our much-vaunted principles of "Peace, Retrenchment, and Reform." Mr. J. Ward, Dr. Macnamara, and Mr. Cremer did well to heckle Mr. Birrell on the subject, and we trust that permission to "teach the young idea how to shoot" with the rifle will forthwith be withdrawn. It may well be that the blame actually rests with the permanent officials and only technically upon Mr. Birrell. In that case it is to be hoped that the permanent officials will get the "wigging" they deserve. Permission, of course, had been given to teach the boys only to shoot. But this would not satisfy some of the conscriptionists. They seem, indeed, to be in such a state of "nerves" that they have lost all sense of humour. "Only one thing," says the *Huddersfield Examiner*, "was needed to reduce to ridicule the efforts of the 'Blue Funk school' as the *Speaker*[1] recently dubbed the advocates of conscription. That one thing has been cheerfully supplied by the Vicar of North Molton, North Devon. Writing in the character of 'a clergyman,' who professes to be both a man and a Christian,' he solemnly says: 'I would have every girl as well as every boy taught the use of the rifle, so as to be prepared, in case of emergency, to defend their homes, together with their brothers, husbands, and fathers. This is the spirit I inculcate in my own parish. We want patriotic men and women, not cowards, and sneaks.' The Rev. Mr. Clunn—the name ought to be sent down to posterity as that of the man who

[1] We are under the impression that this phrase originated with the WESTMINSTER REVIEW.—ED.

killed the conscription movement in England—would bring 'Our Fair Defenders' out of the region of comedy into that of actual fact. And that characteristic touch about 'cowards and sneaks!' Such a description of those who would have national policy impregnated with the principles of the religion which Mr. Clunn is presumed to teach shows how far a clergyman of the Establishment in a sleepy little community of which he should be the guiding light may fall behind the upward movement of the times."

"Why we Lost."

The results of the municipal elections have been hailed by the Tories as a great set-back to Liberalism and as showing that the country is already repenting its action at the elections of January last. But we think that they are mistaken in their diagnosis of the case. Many seats were lost to the party of progress as the result of those three-cornered fights which are becoming more common in local as well as in national elections. The remedy for this state of affairs is obvious, and when that obvious remedy has been applied we fancy that little cause for rejoicing will be left to the reactionaries. As for the rest, we are convinced that in the great majority of cases the seats were lost, not because the people are already tired of the Liberal Party, but first because, especially in the case of London, the Progressives allowed the monopolists to catch them napping, and second because the Progressives were not radical enough, because, as the Yankees say, they were "afraid of their horses." That this is so is brought out in an illuminating article, "Why We Lost," by Mr. C. F. G. Masterman, M.P., in the *Daily News* for November 5. Mr. Masterman, in fact, throws a far stronger light upon the matter than he is himself aware of: "It was not terror of Labour, but terror of the rate collector which was the first exciting cause of the great debacle . . . The ratepayer is turning and turning again in the hope of easing his pain. He is writhing into 'Moderate' hands to-day. Three years hence, with his pain unabated, he will writhe into 'Progressive' hands again—or any plausible alternative to his present condition. And such writhing is inevitable so long as all social progress and the maintenance of a rudimentary urban civilisation are dependent upon a tax on houses." Yes; "terror of the rate-collector . . . was the first exciting cause of the great debacle." But what alternatives to the "tax on *houses*" has Mr. Masterman to offer? "Only two forms of relief are possible," he tells us. "The municipality may work *the* monopolies which are the property of the people for the benefit of *the* ratepayer." This quite oblivious of the fact that if the people pay lower rates they can afford to pay higher rents, and the *landlord* will see to it that they do so! "The other form of relief," he adds, "is the diverting of the betterment which is heaped upon the

land by the activities of the city into the public coffers. Had this been effected half a century ago, London to-day would be paying no rates at all, but living on its land values. To-day a similar change could be effected for London of 1956. But the energy and capacity for such a change has not yet been manifest. No one is interested in London of 1956. 'What has posterity done for us, that we should concern ourselves for posterity?'" Assuredly, if the above fairly represents the "Progressive" position, if the question of relieving the ratepayer by the taxation of land values was put before the people with no more knowledge and no more courage than Mr. Masterman here displays, the cause of the debacle is at once made clear. The ratepayer wants relief, and is entitled to relief, here and now—not in 1956!! The 518 local bodies who have petitioned Parliament in favour of the rating of land values, and who have manifested considerable energy and capacity in pursuit of their object, are thinking of a relief to be obtained in 1907—not in 1956!! In Huddersfield, where the debacle has been on the Tory, not on the Liberal side; where the Liberals captured three seats from the Tories and one from the Socialists, though the Socialists offset their loss by capturing a seat from the Tories; in Huddersfield this was made clear. And if the Liberal Government fails to "make good," if it fails to carry next session a Bill empowering local authorities to forthwith materially lower the "tax on houses" and to tax present land values, not the future "unearned increment," it is very safe to say that next November the debacle will spread to Huddersfield also, and that the Liberal forces throughout the country will be completly routed. Indeed, if the Government wish to avert the overwhelming defeat of the Progressives at the London County Council elections next March, they will do well to carry a Land Values Assessment Bill in the present session, and pledge themselves hard and fast to carry a Land Values Rating Bill in the spring of next year.

The Trade *v.* Trusts.

Mr. Chiozza-Money, M.P., another *Daily News* young man, has been distinguishing himself on the platform, in the Press, and in Parliament by urging his Majesty's Government to assume control of what he is pleased to term the "Cotton Trust" and the "Soap Trust."[1] Even Mr. Chiozza-Money must recognise that these "trusts" are mere nothings as compared with the huge Trusts of the United States, and as a Free Trader of a sort, he must realise that it is the small instalment of Free Trade that we at present enjoy that is responsible for this very notable difference. We would suggest to Mr. Money that if he will only study with greater care the fundamental principles of Free Trade he will find that his proposal that

[1] Since this was written the "Soap Trust" bubble has burst.

the State shall assume control of the "Cotton Trust" and the "Soap Trust," would, if carried out, be a direct infringement of Free Trade principles. Just as the true cure for the evils apparently arising from freedom is more freedom, so the true cure for the monopolies and other evils apparently arising from Free Trade is, not less Free Trade, but more. Our external trade is as yet only partially free. It must be made wholly free, and we must also, as the Premier has pointed out,[1] secure full internal freedom of trade. Under such conditions small manufacturers would not be overburdened as they now are by land monopoly and local rates, and their standing charges would not be so fatally great in proportion to output as compared with those of the great firms or "trusts." And even if "big capitals" are to be the rule in the future, voluntary co-operation affords a ready means of safeguarding the public interest; and, significantly enough, to-day's *Daily News* contains the announcement of the formation of a co-operative soap company to fight the "trust." Of course the interests of the "trust" employees must also be considered, but their interests, though Mr. Money seems incapable of grasping the point, would be amply safeguarded by the application of Free Trade principles to the land—by the taxation of land values.

"The Boer Raid."

The Yellow Press—naturally the Yellow Press is the Pro-pigtail Press—has made the most of the "Boer raid" from German territory into Cape Colony. A handful of Boers have crossed the border into the desolate north-western part of Cape Colony, and have raided one or two police camps, and immediately the Jingoes have visions of a "Boer rebellion," and all the rest of it. We should not be surprised to hear—after the Transvaal elections are well over, of course—that there is no truth whatever in the report of the alleged raid, though it is possible that there may be some slight substratum of truth in it; but if so, it is more than probable that the Rand magnates who see their unholy power in danger, and will stick at no means or meanness, however desperate, to preserve that power—it is more than probable that the Rand magnates, who have had previous experience in the "engineering" of raids, to wit the Jameson raid of 1896, and the Imperial raid of 1899–1902, have engineered this "raid" also with the object of raising the racial issue, and so drawing a red herring across the trail of John Chinaman's pigtail. It is true that this alleged "raid" is, on the face of it, a very farcical business, but it could not well be more farcical than the raid in which the present Premier of Cape Colony played so prominent and so ignominious a part. We cannot believe that the people of the Transvaal, whether Britons or Boers, will allow this "raid" to

[1] Norwich, October 27, 1904.

influence them in the slightest. We trust that they will prove themselves worthy of the self-governing powers they now enjoy, and we are glad to know that it is the intention of the Home Government to confer similar powers on the Orange River Colony also, and thus deal a deathblow at the Jingo policy, the Rand magnate policy, of dividing the people of South Africa, so that they may the more readily exploit them.

Repatriate Lord Selborne!

Once more we reiterate our demand for the repatriation of Lord Selborne. Thanks to the moral courage and persistency of Mr. Mackarness, a Government inquiry has been made into the state of morals obtaining in the Chinese compounds, and the result of that inquiry has been to justify right up to the hilt the declaration made by Mr. Mackarness in the House of Commons that "the herding together of 50,000 Chinese of the lowest class, without women, has introduced into our new colony a horrible moral cancer." Yet at such a time Lord Selborne has chosen to depart from the impartiality in matters political that should characterise a High Commissioner, and has exhibited his pro-Chinese leanings by bespeaking for Sir Percy Fitzpatrick, war-monger and slave-monger, a fair hearing in Pretoria. After the Bucknill report John Chinaman must go, and that right speedily; and Lord Selborne must also go. Repatriate Lord Selborne.

Foreign Affairs.

William Randolph Hearst, the Harmsworth of the United States, has been defeated by 60,000 votes in his candidature for the Governorship of New York, and at this result all true democrats must rejoice. His alliance with "Boss Murphy," whom Hearst's own papers had been describing as only fit for the penitentiary, was quite sufficient to condemn him. If Democracy cannot win in America without the "Bosses," it must even be content to lose, and to go on losing till it can win with clean hands. William Jennings Bryan is the man for a clean fight. Hearst's defeat leaves the way clear for him, and if Bryan is only sufficiently radical on the land question, and sufficiently strong in his anti-Trust and anti-Tariff pronouncements, he should head the poll in 1908.——In France, M. Clemenceau has formed a new Cabinet—a Cabinet more Socialistic than any of its predecessors. The nationalisation of the railways is to be at once taken in hand; but the compatriots of Bastiat, Quesney, and Turgot do not yet realise the vital importance of the taxation of land values, and we have instead proposals for a graduated income tax and a tax on pianos!——The United States proposes to grant home rule to the Philippines next spring. In the meantime Cuba has again been occupied by American troops,

and one cannot avoid an uneasy suspicion that President Roosevelt's policy has been dictated by the Sugar Trust and other Tariff beneficiaries who wish to exploit the island.——Russia is still seething with revolt. The bureaucracy are doing their utmost to secure a subservient Duma, and are dragooning the people into submission more brutally than ever. Brutality begets brutality and so matters go from bad to worse. But the Czar's coffers are depleted, money must be found, and herein lies a further opportunity for Western Europe to show its sympathy for the poor moujik by refusing to grant a loan unless the Czar on his part grants genuine reforms. Will Western Europe neglect this opportunity also?

SHOULD NOT THE PUBLISHING OF FALSE NEWS BE BY LAW A MISDEMEANOUR?

"Thou shalt not bear false witness."

THE English Press is a great institution and a noble monument of the great things that can be done by means of private enterprise. Those who are zealous for its maintenance unimpaired as the Fourth Estate of the realm should take note of any sign of decadence, and do what in them lies to preserve the Press as the guardian of the public interest, and prevent it from becoming a medium for private gossip, pandering to a morbid desire for the sensational, regardless of truth or kindly consideration for what should be private affairs.

He who robs one of his purse does *not* steal trash. He takes that which is the legitimate fruit of one's industry, the provision one has made for the support of himself and those dependent on him, and the State is fulfilling one of its truest functions when giving its protection against theft.

Should not the State in like manner protect one against the calumniator who tries by false witness to rob one of his good name? Surely one's character is entitled to at least the same consideration as is given to one's cash.

Hardly a day passes but one reads false news in some newspaper. On January 3 of last year in the "second extra" edition of an evening paper appeared the announcement "Attempt on the Czar." In the "late edition" of the same paper this had evolved into "Feared Attempt on the Czar." On the following day the morning papers told us that the news of the "second extra" was false.

To take a recent example, only the other day a morning paper allowed a member of its staff to write of a conspicuous Englishman and his wife thus: "I hear that a deed of separation between . . . has been signed." In the next issue of the same morning paper the following appeared: "Sir George Lewis states that the reports which have been published that . . . have signed a deed of separation, and that their children are in the custody of . . ., are without foundation."

The lie direct could not have been more pointedly given. Yet there has been no apology or expression of regret that the paper

had given publicity to this false news about the private affairs of an English family. Neither could the decadent journalist allow the incident to close with the contradiction given by Sir George Lewis. The morbid appetite of his readers must be provided for, or the sale of the paper might be reduced, and therefore immediately following on the contradiction we have this exquisite bit of impudence: "It is untrue that a deed of separation has *yet* been signed."

Could there be a more malignant anticipation of a regrettable event? Such an anticipation would in many a case of misunderstanding be the last straw to break the back of the patient camel of friendship on its journey to the oasis of reconciliation.

The freedom of the Press is a jewel to be maintained at all cost, but the publication of false news is no more to be associated with freedom than theft is to be associated with free exchange.

The newspapers which give currency to false news are registered at the General Post Office, and are in consequence sent through the mails for less than the cost of transmission, in deference to the fetish that it is in the public interest for the State to afford facilities to the Press irrespective of whether its news is true or false. Is this distribution by the State of what is known to be false news any less monstrous than it would be for the parcels department of the General Post Office to afford facilities for the transfer of property known to be stolen?

The State gives due recognition to the command "Thou shalt not steal." Is it not time for the State to give a like recognition to the command "Thou shalt not bear false witness"?

Surely, in the interest of all, so serious an offence as the publishing of false news should be made by law a misdemeanour. For the first offence it might suffice to withdraw from the guilty party, for a period, the privilege of sending his publications through the post or of receiving telegrams at Press rates, but for a second offence stronger measures of correction should be taken in the interest alike of the public and private life of the members of the community.

Mark H. Judge.

PRISCILLA BRIGHT M'LAREN.

To how many letters private and public, to how many circulars and appeals has the name heading this article been adhibited! For faithful to her friends, warm in her affections, ceaseless in her activities as a consoler of distress, and a champion of righteousness and truth, Mrs. M'Laren was a prolific writer, and her epistles were always as charming as her platform eloquence was inspiring. Few newspaper readers during the past thirty or forty years who saw her name at the foot of a letter laid down the broad sheet before they had learned what the recognised public instructress in righteousness had to say. Now, her happy humanising and withal victorious warfare on earth ended, her name is transferred from the bottom to the top of the published articles. In her beautiful home, Newington House, Edinburgh, on the morning of Monday, November 5 last, in the ninety-second year of her age, she passed peacefully to her rest, and while the many friends whose love she won are paying glowingly affectionate tributes to her memory, the thousands who only knew her by name or by her work, will turn with keen interest to her life record for some fuller explanation of the secret of her refining and ennobling influence.

It is customary to speak of Edinburgh as gradually losing its fame as a modern Athens. Its light now as a literary centre or as a school of philosophy may not be so brilliant as the effulgence of a century ago. Its leadership in medical science to-day may be somewhat less marked than it was at the time Christison and Syme, Simpson and Lister taught and practised. Its religious life as a Presbyterian Mecca may be less fitted to excite the wonder of the world than in the heroic Disruption epoch. Yet as a seat of law and learning, literature and religion, it still occupies a place of enviable distinction, and among its shining lights during the past fifty years, the illumination contributed by Newington House has been not the least distinguished or beneficent. None has been steadier or more prolonged, and if during the half century three distinct manifestations have been made, the unceasing spiritual purpose sustaining them all has made the trinity a unity.

The first of these Newington House gladdening rays may be described as a moral reforming force; the root of the bracing activities that here had their centre was spiritual sensitiveness and purity. When Duncan M'Laren took Priscilla Bright as his bride to Edinburgh, in

1848, he was one of the foremost citizens in the Scottish capital. He was known as the redeemer of the city from insolvency, and as the fearless opponent of every form of civic corruption and abuse. For him public service was practical religion, and he was universally esteemed as a superlatively able and incorruptible municipal administrator. A few years after his marriage he was called to the Lord Provostship, and among the more notable events of his civic reign two may be here mentioned, because of the appearance in them of the sweetening and gracious influence of Mrs. M'Laren.

The first was the courageous experiment which prepared the way for the Forbes Mackenzie Act enforcing the closing of public-houses in Scotland during Sundays. Under the influence of Lord Provost M'Laren the licence-holders of the city agreed to make a trial of Sunday closing before as yet a Parliamentary Act had been framed. During the time of probation Mrs. M'Laren and he made frequent visits to the poorer parts of the city to note the operation of the new plan and its effects. Long before she had known Edinburgh, Mrs. M'Laren had both in Rochdale and London made herself familiar with the conditions of life among the poor and destitute, as she assisted in the dispensation of the charities that then gave a distinctive character to Quaker virtues. When at a later period she directed the household affairs of her brother, John Bright, in Rochdale, she had actively called into play the same spirit of kindly and beneficent ministration. She was well prepared, therefore, with practical knowledge as well as with sympathy to help her husband when he engaged in the important moral pioneer work as a municipal ruler. Bravely she stood by him in the testing times of sore trial, for the project was mercilessly criticised and denounced; and when in her old age she described to sympathetic hearers the fervour with which poor women in the Cannongate and Cowgate were wont to thank her for the comfort brought into their homes by the closing of the drinking shops on Sundays, her listeners realised that in the good she thus had done she felt abundant compensation for all the efforts she made, and the stimulus in social and moral reform, more particularly as a friend of her own sex, which remained with her till the closing day of her long life.

The second incident in the splendid life work of her heroic husband in which her Quaker influence and training were preeminently conspicuous was the Peace Conference. Lord Provost M'Laren organised and conducted to a surprisingly successful issue in 1853. In that enterprise he had the heartiest co-operation of his two friends, John Bright and Richard Cobden, to whose success in the Free Trade battle he had largely contributed. Mrs. M'Laren's personal influence and connections likewise secured the assistance of many English friends, while the Nonconformists of Scotland were brought into line as faithful advocates of peace at a time when the

war sentiment was exceptionally strong and active, and when their leading men proclaimed views which Mr. Andrew Carnegie in his last St. Andrew's Rectorial address endorsed as in completest harmony with his purpose as the founder of the International Peace Tribunal at the Hague. In the remarkable demonstration so creditable to Scotland, and more especially to the Nonconformists, led by Lord Provost M'Laren, Mrs. M'Laren had no small part, and many representative men carried with them from that national gathering to their own communities a profoundly grateful sense of the value of her work and the nobility of her character.

Henceforth Newington House became a political centre, outgrowing in fame until it out-shadowed Parliament House or the headquarters of the lawyers. In time Mr. M'Laren became senior Member for the City, and the "kingship of Scotland" was transferred from the Lord Advocate to the Edinburgh citizen, who at Westminster came to be known as "Member for Scotland." In all the political work of her husband Mrs. M'Laren was the truest of helpmeets. His friends were hers; and she brought to and retained around her many more friends anxious to co-operate with her in all her labours for truth and righteousness. While in London her influence was increasingly felt among all classes of men in earnest about justice and equality, in Edinburgh her friendship was sought by and readily given to all strivers for social and moral reformation. University professors, ministers of religion, leaders of municipal life and many devoted workers in humbler spheres found comfort and bracing by conversation and consultation with Mrs. M'Laren. Not a few important political conferences were held at Newington House during the frequent visits of Mr. John Bright, and not only leading statesmen but men of distinction in various higher walks of life, when called to take part in some ceremonial function in that city found it a delight to pay homage to the vivacious and gracious hostess who sought to elevate their aims and stimulate their energies on the side of justice and virtue.

Earnestness as a moral reformer and as a political worker gradually transformed Mrs. M'Laren into a champion of women suffrage. It was as the headquarters of the Women's Rights Movement that Newington House shone with a peculiar brilliancy among the lights of Edinburgh during the past quarter of a century. As a believer in her sex, Mrs. M'Laren strongly felt that the women voters would support the cause of purity and impart a new impulse to reforming forces. Anxious that her sex should be fully qualified intellectually for all kinds of public work she joined in the agitation for the opening of university classes for women students, and she was privileged not only to witness the triumph of this reform but to see it justified by many brilliant successes in the class lists and

by a general advance of female education throughout the country to the levels hitherto supposed to be attainable only by the stronger and sterner sex. Conscious that in educational and poor-law administration which has to do as much with girls and women as with boys and men, there is constant need for womanly knowledge and sympathy, she courageously advocated the inclusion of women in the governing bodies, and for many years this equality of sex in public administration has been vindicated with a clearness and a fullness that have almost silenced the objectors. The political franchise has not been conceded to women, though the municipal and educational have been; but the battle for the higher privilege has constantly been going on the side of the women since that great gathering of ladies—as representative and as inspiring in its way as the Peace Conference of 1853 already referred to—over which Mrs. M'Laren presided in Edinburgh a quarter of a century ago. From that time onward till the day of her death Mrs. M'Laren remained at the head of the movement for the establishment of the political rights of women. The story of the struggle formed no small part of her own life record, from the seventies of the nineteenth century unto the sixth year of the twentieth. As the guide, philosopher and friend of the cause her courage and fidelity never failed; and during her last illness shortly before she lapsed into the unconsciousness from which she never recovered, she sent a message of sympathy to the women suffering imprisonment for their zeal and constancy in claiming political justice for their sex.

Mrs. M'Laren will ever be remembered by those who knew her as one of the gentlest and bravest of women. Born and nurtured in a pious Quaker's home, she was trained in the love of those things that are lovely. Faithful to that early religious training she lived a remarkably pure and stainless life. The joy of her parents, the pride of her brothers and sisters, she became the devoted and cherished wife of one of the most heroic and patriotic Scotsman. In the love and loyalty of sons and daughters and of grandchildren she was privileged to see a reproduction of many of the virtues she ever valued as better than rubies. And if few women ever did more for her friends, she was enriched in return with a wealth of genuine and admiring friendship to which many pure-minded men and women in Scotland and England, in America and the Colonies found it one of the greatest prides and privileges of their lives to contribute. The loving admiration ripened into veneration as she advanced far beyond the allotted span of life, and with undiminishing, or rather with ever-increasing, enthusiasm and mental vigour, and with unceasing activity she responded to the impulses of a pure heart that had learned to glow for other's good.

J. B. Mackie.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE

THE movement for Woman's Suffrage has taken a new departure, and startled a large mass of the community, who were wont to think of this cause, if they thought of it at all, as one of the fads of a few, and, like the poor, "always with us."

With the advent of a newly-elected and widely democratic Parliament there came into existence a body of women who called themselves "Social and Political," and they expressed their determination to get the Parliamentary Franchise, and in order to obtain it they announced they were willing to go to prison, or even to die for it.

Before the General Election certain members of this body brought their cause prominently before the public by interrupting Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman in the Albert Hall, and making similar incursions into the meetings in the provinces, and notably at Manchester. They committed breaches of the peace, assaulted the police, and very early in their movement a few of them appeared in the docks of police stations.

Then followed that General Election which placed a Liberal Government in power, largely supported by Labour members, who were to a man pledged in support of the franchise for women. The Liberal party during the years when they had been in Opposition had received much at the hands of their women supporters. When the party was at its lowest ebb, in funds, in reputation, and in disfavour with the bulk of the constituencies, Liberal women never lost either head or heart. They did "spade work," and they organised and believed in the future of the Liberal party, when the male voter and the would-be Liberal candidates were either sulking in tents, or were beaten and dispirited from the campaign. Slowly, and unnoticed during these years, the political understanding of the working women had been slowly maturing, and now began to make itself felt. They saw that the lives of the working men had steadily improved ever since the passing of the Reform Bill. They noted the growing power and organisation of Trades' Unions, and when they considered the ways of Parliament they found the perception of what happened there considerably quickened by constantly recurring measures which restricted and hampered the area of their own breadwinning.

A series of Factory Acts penalised the labour of women, in

favour of men and boys, and over and over again denied to the status of women "the liberty of the subject." Side by side with this went legislation which curtailed the small amount of administrative power which had been hardly won by women. When the County Councils were erected they were pronounced by the law incapable of serving on these bodies. When the vestries were swept away, on which they had long had the right to sit, they were denied the right by the House of Lords to sit on the new Municipal bodies. When the School Boards were dismissed they could only be nominated without the power of the purse, on the Education Committees of the County Councils. Legislation which would dismiss the Poor Law Guardians was foreshadowed by both parties in the State, and the women who had served the State in Education, Poor Law, and Municipal work saw themselves either swept out of the machine of government, or believed the future held their further extinction.

These things happened during the twenty years of Unionist Government; Liberals and Unionists alike had protested, and during that period more than one private member succeeded in passing a Bill for the Enfranchisement of Women. The Commons would not fight the Lords when they declared women incapable of serving in municipal legislation.

With the dawn of power to a great Liberal party, and the election of a Parliament pledged by a large majority, drawn from both sides of the House, to the principle of Woman's Suffrage, the Constitutional Associations, with a life-long experience behind them, and the newer life of the Women's Social and Political Union, took heart of hope.

The Liberal Prime Minister received a large and representative deputation in the Foreign Office. He spoke honestly as to his own disability to act in the face of a hostile minority in his Cabinet, and he counselled patience, and deprecated such scenes as had already taken place on his Downing Street door-step. The old Parliamentary hands knew they could expect little else, and that they must use the methods of Parliamentary importunity and, if necessary, Parliamentary obstruction. They saw that to introduce amendments to Bills, and to push enfranchising measures, was the way to work within Parliament, and to run candidates of their own in the constituencies was the method to push on the cause. This view was not taken by the younger organisation, they fulfilled their promise to suffer imprisonment, and once they were lodged there the storm broke.

Had "the Old Guard" been asked whether these tactics should be pursued, they would have done their best to stop them. To their minds, breaches of the peace was not the way to be allowed to assist the legislation of the country. They would have pressed their

zealous supporters into the ranks of the law-abiding. They were not asked, and the movement went on. Women went to prison for the cause, and at once the male voter was deprived of one of his favourite arguments, that "no woman really cared for the vote." The Press miscalled the individuals, and mishandled the facts. At once there sprang up, even as a breeze from the ocean, a new and quickening spirit. Men and women who before had held aloof, now owned themselves convinced that the women citizens demanded only what was their right. Some asserted that they had been driven back, and were no longer sympathisers. A close scrutiny of their "lives and conversation" proved they never had been supporters. Interest has been roused, and what Suffrage Societies have not achieved in sixty years has been achieved in six months, and the cause is now one of Practical Politics.

Resistance to the law, whether as a passive resister against the taxes imposed by legislation, or breaches of the peace against the police, or within the police courts, are of the same nature. The passive resister has won for himself an Act of Parliament, which attempts to deal with his grievance on the Education question.

So far women have only been told that the fair promises made to them in such abundance during the time of the General Election, and the hopes held out by their supporters in the House of Commons, are doomed to disappointment. Instead of any Bill which gives them Enfranchisement, a Plural Voting Bill has been introduced, which is really a disfranchising measure, and cannot be passed with any show of justice without redistribution and the inclusion of women citizens. A private member's Bill enabling them to sit on those Municipal and other Councils from which they have been displaced, has been persistently set aside by the Government, and other most contentious private Bills have been taken up.

Under these conditions there is little wonder that the women's patience and faith have failed them, even as it did of those who sought enfranchisement before the great Reform Bill.

The rioters and rick-burners of that time were not the men who helped that Reform to become law. They were the red danger-signal of a great injustice that had held the people dumb. The battle was won, and the Reformers, by organisation and the slow and widening process of a healthy public opinion—that public opinion, the great conscience of the nation, is at work to-day, and every woman can help, or by her unenlightened apathy hinder the Cause. The full enfranchisement of the duly qualified citizen, be it male or female, is at hand, and the signs of the time show that the waiting will not be long.

FRANCES BALFOUR.

THE HON. AUBERON HERBERT.

I had but a slight acquaintance with Mr. Auberon Herbert, and therefore leave his intimate friends to speak of his wit, his personal charm, his many accomplishments and interests. I knew him as a thinker and economist, and in that capacity he will be sadly missed by the little band who looked up to him as one of their leaders. The *Times*, in its obituary notice of Mr. Herbert, said that his place would have been higher if he had been more in touch with the spirit of the age. Doubtless. Yet we have read of innovators who were sadly out of touch with the spirit of their age, whose lives were in a worldly sense total failures, who yet are looked up to as saints and who count their followers by hundreds of millions. Mr. Herbert said himself that reading Herbert Spencer's masterpiece, *The Man versus the State*, spoiled his political life. But it made, or will make, the life of every one of his countrymen happier.

Mr. Herbert was one of the few who try to introduce into economics the idea of principle, which is generally recognised in morals. That is, to elevate into a rule that line of conduct which long experience has shown to be beneficial in most cases, and then in each future case to be guided by that, refusing to be led astray by passion, self-interest, or apparent temporary gain. He upheld the grand principles of absolute freedom and complete responsibility. He was not an Anarchist. Anarchy is absence of Government interference with rogues; Freedom is absence of Government interference with honest men. He looked upon Government as an evil, if a necessary one. So is the surgeon's knife an evil, only to be used to combat a definite, overt wrong. He looked upon the members of a Government as our servants, appointed and paid by us, like our domestic servants, for fixed duties—namely, to vindicate for us the rights that we might, if we had the power, vindicate for ourselves. So, if I have no right to seize another man by the throat and take from him money to feed and educate my child, neither has Government. I think he was mistaken in advocating voluntary taxation. If a policeman walks along the street to protect my neighbours' shops he protects mine, even though I refuse to pay. Collecting money as a tax is cheaper and less troublesome than collecting it as a toll, and so long as the golden rule is

observed that money is only collected for services which all enjoy, no injustice is done.

The words with which Mr. Herbert closed the introduction to his volume *A Politician in Trouble About His Soul*, are worthy of being written in letters of gold: "It is only the unfit things which require force for their establishment and maintenance." So John Bright said: "Force is no remedy for discontent." So said Jesus of Nazareth: "They that take the sword [to propagate their opinions] shall perish by the sword."

Mr. Mark Judge, like myself, was associated with Mr. Herbert in the Personal Liberty Club in the seventies of the last century. When Mr. Judge last year founded the British Constitutional Association, from which many of us hope so much, Mr. Herbert was in Algiers, but wrote to express his sympathy with the new body, and on his return to England he became an Associate and took a deep interest in the work of the new Association.

In an address to the Personal Liberty Club on June 25, 1880, Mr. Herbert said: "The fashion of legislating to remove every form of evil is so strong among us at present, the faith in officialism is so complete, and the memory of past failures in law-making so evanescent, that it becomes of importance that those few of us who steadily believe that the world has only progressed by enlarging the sphere of action and thought for those who live in it should make some opportunity for expressing the reasons of the faith that is in us."

Mr. Herbert's last public appearance was the reading of his Herbert Spencer lecture in the Sheldonian Theatre at Oxford on June 7 last. The MS. of that lecture was lent to a journalist, who lost the latter half. At the request of the committee of the British Constitutional Association Mr. Herbert re-wrote this, and gave the lecture to the Association. The honour of reading this lecture at Essex Hall on November 22 was given to me. This last production of the pen of the brilliant disciple of Herbert Spencer is a worthy postcript to the life-work of an author whose teachings are full of thoughts of the first order.

I quote the following from the part of the lecture which was re-written for the Association:

"The only true use of force is for the destruction, the annihilation of itself, to rid the world of its own mischief-making existence. Even when used defensively it still remains an evil, only to be tolerated in order to get rid of the greater evil. It is the one thing in the world to be bound down with chains, to be treated as a slave, and only as a slave, that must always act under the command of something better and higher than itself."

HENRY WILSON.

A LITTLE CLOUD LIKE A MAN'S HAND.

ALL Britons are exceedingly and justly proud of the Imperial Parliament. There our history has been made; there have been heard the eloquence and wisdom of statesmen of whom Athens and Rome in their palmiest days would have been proud; there cluster thousands of associations which endear it to the heart of the nation. It has grown with the nation's growth, and adapted itself to the progressive aspirations of the people, always advancing along the path of freedom, and always reflecting in its members the expanding political capacity of the age. Now and again we observe a retrograde movement, caused in nine cases out of ten by a premature advance. But a sufficiently wide survey shows that it faithfully represents the political capacity of the people from time to time. Without this adaptation to the spirit of the age a representative institution could not live.

Its tone and calibre have naturally varied from age to age, but in every age it has been an assembly of gentlemen. This is particularly noticeable in the history of the House of Commons, to which admission has been won by many men who, in a profligate age, were notorious for profligacy. But they no sooner entered than they felt the influence of the spirit of the place, submitted to the unwritten laws of the House, left outside their bad language and worse morals, and in every respect behaved, spoke, and dressed like gentlemen. The dignity and honour of the House of Commons have for over 600 years been effectively safeguarded by the imperious edicts of the *genius loci.*

The average Englishman cannot conceive how government is possible without a Parliament or a House of Commons. As some government has existed for centuries in these islands, and will continue to exist so long as they lift their crest above the waves, he does not think the House of Commons had a beginning, and scouts the idea that it will ever have an end. Well-informed and thoughtful people, however, know that, though Parliament was a venerable institution before pipes were smoked and potatoes planted in the kingdom, yet it may be outlived by these fragile and humble ministers which supply man with comfort and food. They are, at the same time, persuaded that no external force or influence can prevent it from enduring as long as Britain is inhabited by

Britons. Nothing can destroy the life, or even impair the usefulness of the House of Commons but the House of Commons itself.

Those who are concerned for the honour and dignity of the House of Commons are growing anxious and alarmed. The last General Election has revolutionised the character of the House, into which has been introduced a new element, carrying in with it new manners and new principles of its own, while its influence has already materially affected the behaviour and manners of the other and older elements. The *genius loci* is in danger of losing all his influence. Into the political sky there has arisen out of the sea of factions a little cloud like a man's hand.

In the last Parliament, where their party was very small, one or two of the Labour members ostentatiously disregarded the unwritten laws of the House, in which they appeared so oddly apparelled as if they were their own tailors, as they have taken care to inform us that they are their own shoeblacks; but, being few, they only made themselves ridiculous. In this Parliament their party is numerically strong. Now, as men in a body will readily do that which alone they would never dream of attempting, it is feared, not altogether without reason, that in this year of grace the honourable members who represent Labour in Parliament may indulge in such sartorial exhibitions as cannot fail to expose the House of Commons to public ridicule.

The Labour members act on a principle which is intelligible, and from motives that, given an adequate cause, are commendable. They wish to show the world in general, and the House of Commons in particular, that they are not ashamed of the rock whence they are hewn, and of the hole of the pit whence they are digged.

Laudable as is the determination of the Labour members to demonstrate their loyalty to their order, yet the means which they employ for that purpose proves nothing, while it forces them into an extreme singularity of behaviour. It is not by the cut of his coat, the quality of his boots, or the price of his headgear that a man proves the stuff he is made of, or best serves the order whence he sprang. It is actions, not apparel, that proclaim the man. A fashionably dressed millionaire, who was born and bred in a humble cottage, may, by wise munificence, improve the circumstances of the class from which he is sprung. In this way he better proves his loyalty to the old order than if he were to dress like a navvy and hoard his money like a miser. Let not the Labour members, therefore, entertain the delusion that the cut of their coats is a clue to the state of their hearts. Any clown, if he have effrontery enough, can don eccentric apparel. The Labour members are men of honour and ability; otherwise they would not be where they now are. A moment's reflection will make it clear to them that, without abating one jot of their pride of birth, they can look after the interests of

their order—play the orator and act the statesman—in a frock coat as well as in a reefer jacket, and in a silk hat as well as in a cloth cap.

Now all the world over the different handicrafts are distinguished by appropriate clothes. There is one dress for the cobbler, another for the smith, another for the carpenter, and another for the painter. Football and cricket have their several uniforms, without which no Labour member of the club would appear on the field. Working men are, within their own circle, scrupulous observers of the laws of fashion. When a journeyman carpenter is made a walking foreman he forthwith dons the morning-coat and silk hat which custom prescribes for the vocation to which he has been promoted, and this he does without losing caste among his old mates, sinking in the estimation of his own people, or forfeiting the good opinion of anybody whose good opinion is worth having. Why, then, should workmen, when they receive the highest appointment that can be bestowed on them, disregard the customs of their own order, cultivate an unreasonable singularity of behaviour, and appear like crows in a parliament of peacocks?

All working men wear the clothes of convention to lead their brides to the altar, to attend the funeral of their mothers-in-law, and to escort their wives and families on a party of pleasure. They could in any clothes show their joy at marriage, their grief at the death of their lamented relative, and their delight in the excursion; but they choose to appear on these occasions in conventional apparel, and by respecting the feelings and tastes of others they respect themselves. It is only in the House of Commons, the august mother of Parliaments, that the toilers discover an unbalanced mind, and forget the respect which they owe to others as well as to themselves. Spoiled children improve their manners when they obtain the toy for which they have been crying; but the sons of Labour no sooner reach the goal of their ambition than they show bad manners and make themselves disagreeable.

It is no mark of disloyalty to his class for a man to dress like his equals. Nobody expects the millionaire who began life in a coal-pit to dress like a pitman; nor would any sensible pitman be hurt by the sight of his carriage, which would furnish them with an object-lesson on the value of industry and thrift. A sufficient number of constituents have thought the Labour members worthy of a seat in the oldest and most respectable club in *Europe*. So long as they retain their seats they are the equals of the other members of that club, to whose fashions it is their duty, as it ought to be their pride, to conform. By disregarding these fashions they do not confer honour on their order, or show respect to themselves. But they are guilty of disrespect towards their *fellow-club*men, whom a prudent politician would not dream of alienating by

such a childish affectation as the length of a coat or the shape of a hat.

It is in the power, as it is to the interest, of the Labour members to prevent this catastrophe. When they fairly consider the matter, they must own that their behaviour springs from pride, and is intended to offer a studied insult to their aristocratic colleagues, as well as to flout the traditions of the House.

But example is better than precept. If the Labour members are loath to imitate the Asquiths and the Wyndhams, let them conform to the practice of the greatest working man that ever lived. They will own that he began as low down the ladder as the humblest of them, and that he was as richly endowed by nature as the most gifted among them, as they will, perhaps, not deny that he climbed as high as the most eminent among those who climbed, or is likely to climb. He came from a soap-boiler's shop, passed through a printing-house, enlarged the bounds of science, conferred familiarly with statesmen and philosophers, sat at the tables of kings, and signally assisted a young and virile nation to take its place among the independent communities of the world. That man, who has cast upon the Order of Labour the lustre of his immortal name, was Benjamin Franklin. What on the question of dress was the attitude of this great son of Labour? He always did in Rome as the Romans did. A man of simple tastes and frugal habits, and the enemy of all ostentation, yet he readily conformed to the fashions and customs of the people among whom he sojourned from time to time.

In 1767 he went on a journey to France, where he had the honour of dining with the king and queen at Versailles. He not only conformed to the etiquette of the Court, but showed respect to the national tastes. "Travelling," he wrote at the time to a correspondent in England, "is one way of lengthening life—at least, in appearance. It is but a fortnight since we left London, but the variety of scenes we have gone through makes it seem equal to six weeks' living in one place. Perhaps I have suffered a greater change, too, in my own person than I could have done in six years at home. I had not been here six days before my tailor and perruquier had transformed me into a Frenchman. Only think what a figure I make in a little bag-wig, and with naked ears! They told me I had become twenty years younger, and looked very gallant.

"This letter shall cost you a shilling, and you may consider it cheap when you reflect that it has cost me at least fifty guineas to get into the situation that enables me to write it."[1]

The great Franklin spent a large sum of money to have himself transformed into a Frenchman, so that he might conform to the tastes and fashions of a people in whose country he sojourned for a few weeks. Will not our Labour members spend a tithe of that

[1] *Franklin's Works*, ed. Sparks, vii. 363, 364.

sum to have themselves transformed into members of Parliament, so that they may respect the traditions of that great House, and prevent it, so far as in them lies, from becoming an object of public ridicule?

The members and supporters of the late Government declared on a thousand platforms that the electors ought to return them to power because it would be impossible to find outside the Unionist pale the material wherefrom to equip a Government capable of administering the affairs of the Empire. This insolent assertion is a libel on one-half of the nation, and would justify very strong comment from the opposite camp. An eminent statesman of the Labour order referred to this calumny, and politely remarked that the members and supporters of the late Government were a mob of dunderheaded nincompoops and pothouse jingoes.

It is true that opprobrious language like this does not hurt the party or individual assailed; rather it recoils on the head of the assailant. This fact reminds one of the fable of the viper and the file. "This little animal," writes Æsop, "chancing to meet with a file, began to lick it with her tongue till the blood came; which gave her a very silly satisfaction as imagining the blood came from the file, notwithstanding all the smart was in her own tongue." But it is also true that an institution of which the members imitate the silly viper cannot fail to incur the scorn and contempt of all respectable people.

There is also in every house in the land a precious, but now almost forgotten, book, from which our Labour and other legislators might learn many a useful lesson in manners. Would not the persecuted patriarch's scornful but dignified rebuke of his self-righteous and arrogant comforters instruct the members of the Government how to expose the pretensions of their predecessors? "No doubt but ye are the people, and wisdom shall die with you." No doubt, also, but a polished sarcasm of this kind would be a far more effective reply to these pretensions than the vulgar abuse which finds vent in "dunderheaded nincompoops and pothouse jingoes."

The other class which, from perverted taste, offends against good manners is far more dangerous to the prestige of Parliament than that which errs from undisciplined taste. They know what is proper and becoming in speech, but do not hesitate to employ what is vulgar and opprobrious. They have been in the habit of treading the path of good breeding and courtesy, but there is reason to fear that some of them are abandoning it for the dark alleys of rudeness and abuse. When men of light and leading forsake the good ways of their class, there is danger lest their example pervert the rank and file of that class, and so blunt their understandings that they are no longer able to distinguish between what is becoming and what is unbecoming in language, while their influence on the masses cannot fail

to confirm the latter in their love of the strong words and phrases which are current among their order.

That this evil will grow is only too probable. While the proletariat had only votes to record, and were indifferent about the power which votes confer, Parliamentary candidates considered they did their duty by subscribing to the local charities, shaking hands with their rough electors, and kissing their babies, which they called little angels, when they hastened home to fumigate themselves for protection from angelic infection.

The frequent interruptions with which honourable and right honourable members are assailed while delivering their speeches are filling the public mind with scorn and contempt of the assembly in which such practices are not only tolerated, but applauded.

This vulgar practice is every year growing more and more fashionable in the House. Hansard of twenty years ago gives us speeches punctuated with an occasional interruption; now it presents us with interruptions interspersed with fragments of speeches. Of course, there are many members of Parliament who have neither the ability nor the desire to address the House. Formerly these gentlemen used to sit still and listen to those who had something to say; now, in season and out of season, they blurt out their silly interruptions, determined to show to all the world what by silence they might have concealed from all the world—that they have been promoted into a situation for which they are totally unfit.

When a member rises in his place and politely sets a speaker right on a matter of fact he is performing a commendable service to the speaker, who would otherwise be led into vicious reasoning, as he would be wasting the time of the House. This is the only kind of interruption that is justifiable. All else is vulgar and disgraceful. Many of the interruptions, especially those which come from a certain corner of the House, are witty and humorous; but they are as much out of place as cheers in a church, and they are purchased with the degradation of the House and wanton affronts to individuals. This is too high a price to pay for unseasonable wit, however sparkling, and for offensive humour, however rollicking.

If a man at table in a private house interrupts another he is justly considered a rude person, and if he habitually indulges in this practice he will forfeit the respect of gentlemen. Who can measure the rudeness of those who, in an assembly of 600 men, make it the study of their lives to interrupt a member, and, by their interruptions, to embarrass him and expose him to the ridicule of the House? Who can measure the rudeness of those 600 honourable and right honourable gentlemen who applaud the vulgar sally, and laugh themselves hoarse over the ignoble spectacle, which sinks the debates of the House of Commons to the level of fishfags' quarrels?

It is readily admitted that the majority of the interrupters have no intention to disconcert the speaker, as they have no desire to be rude or to be thought vulgar. But the wrong they do to the speaker is none the less real and serious because they do it in a merry sport. A man of sense and honour will on such occasions restrain the playfulness of his temperament, because he is well aware that wrongs and injuries of this kind are not to be measured by the feelings of him who inflicts, but by the feelings of him who suffers them. They who enter a house and, from ignorance, speak and behave in such a way as to disgrace the house and offend the tastes of the inmates are rude and vulgar people; but if they know the purpose for which the house was established, the character of those who manage it, and the regulations on which it is conducted, and yet, this knowledge notwithstanding, persist in offensive language and behaviour, then are they guilty of something that is considerably worse than rudeness and vulgarity.

The House of Commons is a deliberative assembly, of which the proceedings should be conducted with dignity and sobriety. It is not necessary, for this purpose, that the members should wear black clothes and long faces, sit still and silent, repress mirth, shut their eyes, and assume the pose of listening statues. In a deliberative assembly there is room and demand for merriment, wit and humour, which are to the deliberations of men what oil is to machinery, making things run smoothly. But for merriment, wit and humour there is a time also—a fact which is too often forgotten by too many of our legislators. A fair hearing should be accorded to all speakers; and those members who are overflowing with wit and humour should reserve these qualities to adorn their own speeches, instead of dribbling them out to mar those of others.

If our legislators would avert from the House of Commons the scorn and contempt of the people, they must cultivate self-restraint, and restore to its deliberations that dignity and sobriety with which they were wont, not so very long ago, to be conducted. It would be well for them to ascertain how, in other countries, and in different ages, these matters have been managed by the wise and the good. To assist them in their study we append a brief sketch of the manner in which a certain nation conducted its public deliberations: "He that would speak, rises. The rest observe a profound silence. When he has finished and sits down, they leave him five or six minutes to recollect that, if he has omitted anything he intended to say, or has anything to add, he may rise again and deliver it. To interrupt another, even in common conversation, is reckoned highly indecent." [1]

It was in this way that, more than 150 years ago, their national councils were conducted by the Red Indians of North America.

[1] *Franklin's Works*, ed. Sparks, ii. 456.

We call them savages. What, I wonder, would they call the members of the British House of Commons as it is constituted in 1906?

The Government have in hand a Bill to amend the London Equalisation of Rates Act of 1894. It is proposed to add a shilling in the pound on the rateable value of London parishes to the sixpence which the Act of 1894 authorised to be paid into the Equalisation Fund, which shall be divided among the London parishes in proportion to population, not to rateable value. Under this arrangement St. George's, Hanover Square, will have to raise £60,000 a year more than it needs to pay its own expenses; and this sum will be divided among other parishes, which give no consideration whatever for the money. Other rich parishes will have to make similar contributions to other poor parishes, whose claims to this preferential treatment are based on the number of their inhabitants and the extravagance of the municipality in which they lie. This Act will encourage extravagance in the populous municipalities, which will obtain a rebate of their expenditure at the expense of rich parishes, while it will, at the command of Labour the Conqueror, levy on the latter a heavy tribute, in the spending of which they have no voice. The inhabitants of Kensington have their own children to feed, clothe, and educate, and they have to contribute towards the food, clothing, and education of the children in their own elementary schools, while by this Act they have materially to aid Bethnal Green parents to do their duty by their children. Moreover, London has been parcelled out into a number of municipalities which are as distinct and separate from one another as are Birmingham, Bristol, and Brighton; and yet West Ham taxes Westminster, and Poplar the City, without their consent, without even so much as consulting them. How would Birmingham like to be so taxed by, or in favour of, Bristol? What, under this Act, becomes of the principle No representation, no taxation—a principle which we have been taught to regard as the palladium of British liberty?

The people who argue in this fashion are groping in the mists and fogs of an antiquated creed, and are far from the clear light of the new political gospel according to St. Labour. According to the apostles of this new evangel, the principle No representation, no taxation, is the time-worn shibboleth of political sophists. Hundreds of thousands of men and women who smoke tobacco and drink tea or coffee pay taxes imposed on them in an assembly in which they are not represented. It is just and necessary to tax rich parishes for the support of poor parishes. The rich neglected their duty towards the poor. The State had to step in to teach them a lesson, and to compel Kensington, which knows not what to do with its wealth, to assist West Ham, where the bulk of the inhabitants have not the where-

withal to buy the bare necessaries of life. The London Equalisation of Rates Act is only a first step in humane legislation. Not only have the poor and unemployed of Poplar a claim on the rates of all London, but the poor and unemployed of every parish in the United Kingdom have a claim on the rates of that kingdom. The poor are the children of the State, as the unemployed are its unprovided sons and daughters. As it is the duty of the State to feed its poor children, so is it the State's duty to find or make work for all its sons and daughters who are willing and able to work. When the London Equalisation of Rates Act has been expanded into an Equalisation of Rates Act for the United Kingdom, of which the equalisation fund shall be distributed among the parishes of these islands, not in proportion to population, nor in proportion to rateable, but in proportion to the number of their poor and unemployed, then, but not till then, will our statute book have been adorned by Acts that shall cause happiness on earth and joy in heaven, because our rich citizens will thereby have admitted the poor into the full privileges of brotherhood.

It is by means of the rates that the new politicians propose to solve every problem, and to achieve the Labour revolution. The miraculous virtue of the rates to heal the diseases of the commonwealth is the revelation that was reserved for the gospel of St. Labour to publish to mankind. The rates alone, it declares, are adequate to support any generous scheme of reform and to accomplish the social salvation of the masses. Rates, like the grace of God, confer blessings on those who by their works could never merit them; like a dredger's everlasting buckets, they never run dry or empty; like irrigation canals, they scatter their golden contents far away from the source of their collection; and, like figures, they do not lie, neither do they calumniate. As cosmetics hide the wrinkles on the brow of faded beauty, so the rates sanctify alms, and remove from it the stigma of charity. Finally, the rates, like legacies, are paid by one section and spent by another section of the community.

Out of these rates it is the firm determination of the Labour party to provide every Labour household with fire-guards and feeding-bottles; every old man and old woman of sixty-five years of age and upwards with a pension of five shillings a week; every family with the money to enjoy every year a month's holiday at the seaside; and every tool-handling individual with the means of making, at least once in his lifetime, a pilgrimage to Geneva, Rome, Athens, Jerusalem, or Johannesburg.

Under this new dispensation—not so remote as some people affect to believe—there are good times in store for the British workman, whose duty it will be to marry early, be fruitful and multiply, and beget children which the State will clothe, feed, and educate, and render in every way as fit as it is possible for them to become.

How those outside Labour's sacred pale will fare it is not difficult to imagine. Long ere this new *régime* be fully realised among us the old political party names will have been forgotten, and the inhabitants of these islands will have been divided socially, morally, and politically into two classes—the ratepayers and the ratespenders, of whom the latter will retain in their hands the government of the country, as it is only natural that wisdom and strength should rule weakness and folly, while the former will have to find every year at least 200 millions sterling, in return for the permission to reside in the modern paradise and to spend on themselves whatever money, if any, remains in their hands after they have paid their rates and taxes.

Such is the composition of the House of Commons, and such are the aspirations of its dominant section.

The realisation of Labour's revolutionary programme will be expedited by the natural ambition of our great historical parties, who, in order to retain or recover power, will outbid each other for the support of the party of spoliation.

Let there be no illusions on this point. Of all political parties self-interest is necessarily the guiding motive, though all political parties claim that their measures are conceived in the best interests of the State, and many of their measures support this claim. The Labour party, on the other hand, make no such claim. They care not for commercial supremacy, sneer at our glorious history, and spell Empire with a small "e." They are selfish, and are honest enough to proclaim their selfishness to the world. They have been sent to Parliament to further the interests of their class, of whose needs they alone are capable of forming an opinion or of suggesting the alleviation, because they alone know where the shoe pinches as well as where the feet lack shoes. They are resolved to doctor the pinching shoe and to cover the shoeless feet at the expense of the ratepayers.

T. Evan Jacob.

WHAT IS THE MATTER WITH ENGLAND?

A COLONIST'S VIEW.

I

It may be that Englishmen, who like to have their faults pointed out to them, will bear with a colonist, who loves England well, while he tells them what truly is the matter with their country.

Liberals and Conservatives are agreed in this, that there is much to mend. To us at a distance it seems obvious that patches are useless: a new garment is wanted. That, to drop metaphor, nothing short of a revolution can prevent the ruin of the nation.

What sort of revolution then? One with tumbrils of plutocrats, an ever-thirsting guillotine, and a general redistribution of property?

Nothing of all that. On the contrary, a revolution which would involve no bloodshed and require no robbery; but would leave classes and masses on better terms with one another than they have been since the Conquest.

I propose the resumption of the sovereignty of England by the English people.

You say. The People is sovereign. Parliament is supreme; there is nothing to resume.

I reply that law-making is in truth a comparatively trifling matter; the real thing is ownership. Whether you roast or jug your hare or make soup of him matters little; the essential matter is to have the hare. I charge the English people with having weakly given away their hare: with having abdicated their sovereign rights in the soil of England in favour of a comparatively small number of individuals among themselves. These people, in recognition of their lordship, are actually called land-owners. They own England, and under the present *régime* they could in combination turn the rest of the nation out of the country, and import men of other nationalities to do the country's business. They have partly done it in North Britain.

The land-owners can and do enslave their brother Englishmen. The essence of being a slave is that you work, and your master

takes part of your pay. This is exactly what happens to every Englishman who does not live and do his business on his own freehold. His master, the land-lowner, takes part of his pay under the name of rent.

The proportion exacted is surprisingly large. The London *Standard* recently published an article by Mr. L. Cope Cornford entitled "How the Poor Live." When I had read it, I thought, this should have been called "How the Poor Pay Rent." An instance was given of a family earning from 10s. to 12s. a week, and paying 7s. a week rent—for one room. Consider it! With a people less patient and law-abiding than the English that sort of thing would long ago have led to a revolution not bloodless.

But the rent the Englishman pays for his house and for a place to do his work in is by no means all the rent that he pays. He cannot buy the smallest commodity, he cannot buy the slightest service, but he must pay a part of the rent of the seller. So far as cloth and workman's wages are concerned, the tailor who makes me a suit of clothes could profit by a charge of £5. But he has a high rent to pay, and must charge £10 in order to live. The plumber is similarly situated. So is every tradesman except the peddler, and even he buys from a merchant who pays rent. Reckon these surcharges on every item of the citizen's expenditure, and it is easy to see why he usually leaves no estate behind him. To die poor is what happens to the majority of the industrious frugal people of the richest country in the world.

II

It is true that rent must be paid; if not to a private land-owner then to the State. But by the private land-owner it will nearly always be racked or stretched. With the State it is possible to devise a scheme for finding a fair rent.

We shall, if we love our country wish to hear of such a scheme, and to consider if it be in any wise practicable. Here it is:—

Let us suppose that the State has, in the manner to be set forth below, resumed possession of the whole of the land of England, both country and town. The object is now to have it used to the best advantage of the nation. This will be accomplished by dividing it into suitable lots, exactly as at present, and letting each lot for a term to him who will pay the highest price for it. To manage the business for the nation, a Lands Department should be formed, with offices conveniently placed in every part of the country. It should be manned with skilled valuers and other experts in the business of letting land and houses. At the head of it would be the Minister of Lands.

The Land's Department's lettings would be so arranged that on six days of fifty-two weeks in the year the leases of properties of every class were offered by auction. Thus each worker who was paid for his work, and had money or the prospect of money, would have an equal opportunity to secure a home, and, if he needed it, a place to work in. His rent would not be stretched, for he would fix it himself; should someone bid more than he judged the house or workshop was worth he could stop; more houses and workshops would be offered next day, and more after that.

How would this suit the tenant who, at the end of his lease, wished to renew?

In the interest of this individual, and in the public interest, it would be advisable to allow him a substantial reduction upon the highest bid made for its holding. This might be anything from ten to twenty-five per cent. Let us suppose it fixed at twenty per cent. for dwelling-houses. A., paying a pound a week rent for his home, bids up to 25s. for the next eight years' lease. He likes the situation; and since he took the house eight years ago, the town has run an electric tramway past his door, has placed a tepid swimming bath within his easy reach, and employed a municipal band to play every fine evening in the park near by. B., equally appreciative of the tram and the bath, but perfectly mad for band music, bids 30s., and has the lease knocked down to him. However, before B.'s name is written down as the successful bidder, A. has to be asked if he exercises his "occupier's right." He does. Twenty per cent. off 30s. leaves 24s., and at this price A. secures the next lease. It is true that his rent is raised 4s.; but this cannot be called a rack-renting increase considering that he himself offered to pay a shilling more than that, and another free agent was willing to pay 6s. more. B. will have better luck with the next house offered, whose occupier hates music, and is moving to a less progressive town.

The model for the majority of the Lands Department leases would be the "Glasgow Lease," whose essentials are that it is for a comparatively short term, say eight or ten years, and that it provides that the tenant shall receive compensation for unexhausted improvements made with the landlord's sanction.

A *sine qua non* of all leases would be that they were for use by the lessee; sub-letting would be illegal. If a man needed to throw up his lease he would go to the equity section of the Lands Department and be treated with kindness and liberality.

As to the method of resumption, the State should acquire the land from the land-owner by purchase at the present valuation for rating. Payment to each owner should be made by land bond, bearing interest at say 3 per cent., the land bonds to be redeemble at the pleasure of the First Lord of the Treasury. The

sooner they were redeemed the better, and, in addition to a new tax which I will mention later, the Death Duties should be reserved for the purpose, instead of, as at present, being treated as part of the ordinary revenue. The Death Duties produce about £17,000,000 a year, and this sum should be first applied to the redemption of the smallest land bonds, whose owners may conceivably prefer cash even to a safe security yielding 3 per cent. In process of time the Death Duties would redeem the whole of the Land Bonds issued in payment of the Resumption of the Land. Afterwards they could be used to extinguish the debt incurred in the first years of Resumption, when the National Rent, no longer racked, fell far below what had been paid to private land-owners, and it was necessary to borrow to pay the interest on the Land Bonds without disturbing the country's finance. Not many years would elapse, in a country blessed with reformed conditions, before a prosperity greater than it had ever known before would prevail. The workers of every class, put in possession of all the fruits of their labour, would again be seen with large families, which they would rear in peace and plenty, the peace being the certainty of finding food for the children when they were little, and work for them when they were big. The benefits from use of the nation's land being now distributed over the whole body of the workers, instead of concentrated in the hands of the comparatively few land-owners, the nation's expenditure on commodities and services would go up by leaps and bounds, the result being a vast increase of employment within the Kingdom. The multiplying factories and workrooms and work-yards of every kind would urbanise vast areas. This extensive use of the soil must accelerate the unearned increase of value which is so conspicuous a feature of progressive countries.

Mulhall gives the annual increase of house property in the United Kingdom as thirty-three millions. Taking Mulhall's conservative estimate of only 30 per cent. of this as enhancement of value, as distinct from cost of building operations, we have nearly ten millions yearly addition to revenue. This rate of interest being, though checked at first, accelerated in the long run, there would be produced in the whole land an unearned increment of value, which would easily and naturally and without hardship to anybody, raise the total rent of the country, or the National Rent, first to the level of the total of the old private land-owners' rents, and then higher. In that good time Englishmen would see their Land Bonds gradually paid off; then their National Debt paid off, gradually but at a continually accelerating rate; then all taxation remitted, and the State able to spend freely upon military and naval defence, education, provision of houses for the poor, provision for widows, orphans, and all the helpless, and pensions for all incapaci-

tated by sickness, injury, or old age; besides the thousand and one objects of State expenditure—provision of music, for instance—that are proper, provided the State has the money. One of these might be a steady reduction of rents of dwelling-houses until they became almost free of ground rent, and the humblest Englishman could know, by daily experience, that he really was a Sahib, a Lord of the Soil.

This would realise in a way one ideal of Dr. Alfred Russell Wallace—free selection of a home by every citizen.

I admit that there would be a great deal to do to work out the details of Resumption. Not only is the ground landlord to be bought out, but the interest of the building lessee and his tenant and his sub-tenant would have to be estimated and purchased. But we are an adaptable people, and extremely able in administration. It is not rational to believe that the difficulties are insuperable. For encouragement: when Mr. Seddon in New Zealand proposed his most radical measure, the resumption of large estates for closer settlement, he was told that it was repugnant to the whole people that he should take land compulsorily, that if he did he could not pay for it, that he could not let it without jobbery, and, most certainly of all, that he could not get rent enough from his settlers to pay interest on cost. All these things he has done, nevertheless, and the people are asking for more: and there is now in the New Zealand Lands Department a body of expert civil servants whose services would be invaluable to any country entering upon a similar policy. But even without such expert guidance there are in England statesmen, financiers, law lords, actuaries, and practical men of business who can make a great success of the British Lands Department if Parliament will only constitute it.

Resumption will meet bitter opposition from some vested interests; nevertheless, I think it quite possible that many of the largest landlords themselves will welcome the reform as relieving them of a load of responsibility greater than they can bear. The house and estate agents, auctioneers, real estate lawyers, and other able men would find remunerative employment in the Lands Department.

As regards town lands there never was a moment since private ownership of land was first permitted in England when Resumption was not urgently required and immediately appropriate. But as regards rural lands the country could now make an advantageous purchase, because free imports have knocked off a great deal of the stretched monopoly value that land possessed before the abolition of the corn laws. That is to say, the value of land for productive purposes is likely to rise in value, rather than to fall; and this quite apart from the enhancement of value by its steady conversion into town land. Were agricultural produce protected, the State

would be quickly seen to have made a splendid speculation in buying its rural land.

III

Mulhall, revised to 1898, is the latest authority on statistics that I have access to. His valuations for the United Kingdom are complete for the year 1888, when he gives land as worth 1544 millions and houses as 2424 millions. (As capital value and rental increase proportionately these figures will serve as well as later ones.) Interest on the sum of the two would be about 119 millions per annum. The rentals for the same year were: Land, 61 millions; houses, 134 millions. The sum of the two would be 195 millions; providing a surplus of rental over interest of 76 millions.

Against this surplus two main items are to be charged:

(1) Cost of the Lands Department;

(2) Cost of upkeep of the National Estate.

The New Zealand figures may be some help in estimating the first of these. The New Zealand Year Book for 1903 gives the following as actual expenditure for that year:

		£
Postal and Telegraph Services . . .		485,860
Valuation Department . . .	£26,284	
Land and Income-Tax Department.	19,596	
Judicial and Legal . . .	258,633	
		304,513

It will be seen that when to the present cost of valuation and taxing the whole expenditure on law and police is added as a rough equivalent of the extension of the Lands Department beyond its equipment for valuation and taxing, the total still falls far short of the expenditure on Post and Telegraph services. We may therefore be on the safe side if we estimate the cost of the Lands Department for the United Kingdom to equal that of the Post Office, the estimate for which is given by Whitaker (1904) as about eleven millions for 1903-4.

Now as to upkeep.

The conditions of the leases would take care of the upkeep of the country land. For the houses we must allow for upkeep 25 per cent. of the rental, which will give 33½ millions.

The sum of cost and upkeep will be, say, 45 millions, which, deducted from the 76 millions surplus of rental over interest, still leaves us 31 millions available for mitigation of the effects of our past and present rack rents. This would be obtained most directly by building on suitable places for the working classes and the unemployed or poorest class.

Before the Royal Commission on London Transit it was shown says *The Daily Mail Year Book*, "That the price of land in the central districts made it impossible to re-house the working classes there at rents they can afford to pay without a heavy loss to those who undertake the re-housing. The price of land a few miles out is still sufficiently low to admit of re-housing, without loss, at rents well within a working man's means." The Commission therefore asks for better transit facilities.

But the State ought to be able to build houses where they are wanted; and if it owned the land it could do so. Surely this would be better than condemning workmen to travel many miles a day at cost of time and money. Why all this waste of energy and crowding of the public conveyances by hauling people to and from their dwellings when the dwellings can be brought coveniently near to the people?

Similarly the State could build, or by the terms of its leases cause to be built, new Garden Cities; and it could open up and ventilate and beautify old cities to any degree of beauty and wholesomeness which the nation desired. Here valuable example could be taken from Germany, in these respects the most civilised country in the world. Land Resumption would solve the Housing Problem.

For the nation as a whole I submit that this is the mildest revolution ever heard of. England is peculiarly the country in which the Resumption of the Land by the State can be accomplished without perceptible shock, because in no other country has the divorce of the masses from the land been so thoroughly accomplished. Comparatively few Englishmen have owned land; the vast majority have lived all their lives in rented houses, and worked in rented shops, offices, and mills, or farmed rented land. A very few landlords own the greater part of London. To most Englishmen the change will be imperceptible, until they perceive the blessed lowering of rent, and find a perennial source of interest in the Lands Department auction rooms.

IV

This is a reform which, in the words of Sir Edward Grey, is "practicable and reasonable, and conceived in the interests of the community as a whole." It is indeed calculated to unite the nation, as I will show by considering how it squares with the aspirations of the national sects.

The Fiscal Reformer desires more employment, which will produce more population, and strengthen the country for war or peace. Land resumption would, by allowing the willing worker access to the means of production without the unfair handicap of sustaining

a non-producing land-owner, stimulate every kind of producing activity. As in new countries with unlimited soil, so great would be the demand for labour that not only would every capable worker be employed, but the inferior men would also find work—no doubt at special rates to be agreed upon by Arbitration Courts. The effect of this would be the checking of the neo-Malthusianism which is limiting the family in every part of Anglo-Saxondom; for only the severity of the struggle for existence under present conditions has availed to alter the ancient belief that children are the greatest joy and the greatest blessing of all. Thus we have employment and we have population; and as children begotten in hope and reared in plenty have the best prospects of becoming good citizens of our Commonwealth we have a stronger nation, and there is the Fiscal Reformer's ideal realised. It is certain also that present conditions press hardest upon the more intellectual classes, unprotected by trades unions and forced to preserve some appearance of class standards of living. The intellectual and artistic stocks reproduce themselves least. Their units marry later and later, and have few or no children.

The Free Trader lays no stress on number of population. What he is concerned about is that the national welfare shall not be endangered by dear food and other commodities, with resulting dear labour and handicapped industries. I have shown that under private ownership of land everything we buy, whether commodity or direct service, is vastly increased in price by the racking of rents. Let us get rid of that burden, which I see is estimated by Mr. Philip Snowden, M.P., at £450,000,000 a year, and the industrial supremacy of England will be not only regained, but will be carried to a far higher pitch than it knew in the best of the Victorian years. Labour, though its wages be nominally no higher than they are to-day, will be far better paid. Being raised and trained under conditions which will make those of to-day look like savagery, it will be infinitely more efficient. The manufacturer will be better served, his raw materials will be cheaper, and he will be free of the burden of racked factory and office rents; and he will beat his Continental competitors in every line that is worth his attention. The Free Trader's ideal!

There are five live parties in England to-day; the remaining three are the Irish party, the Unionists, and the Labour party—last but not least.

The well-meant legislation of the late Parliament concerning Ireland is doomed to fail as a means of pacification. It does no permanent good to change seven thousand land-owners into seventy thousand land-owners. The seventy thousand will act together with wonderful cohesiveness, and will collectively sweat and enslave the landless with as much ruthlessness and as clear a conviction of their

right to do so as ever the seven had. In fifty years' time there will be just as much misery in Ireland and emigration from Ireland as there is to-day. Nor will the granting of Home Rule solve the Irish Question. It is no great benefit to have a vote for your own Parliament if you are so deeply poor that you are glad to sell it. No! the Irish people, to their eternal glory be it written, rebel against the conditions in which they find themselves. This paper not having been written it has never occurred to them to agitate for Land Resumption by the State, but they have done their best by agitating for No Rent and Less Rent. The latter part of Bernard Shaw's witty classification of Society into the thieves who are content to be wealthy without working, and the dastards who are content to work without being wealthy, finds no galled jade in Ireland to make wince. The Irish have consistently shown the mettle that is in them. And my point is that they would continue to do so though a full powered Parliament sat in College Green; and that every means by which they have exhibited their discontent with existing conditions would still be found to be in use, as long as the people were divorced from the soil (town soil as well as country) as they are at present. But let the State resume the whole land as proposed above, and they would find a natural outlet for all their spirit and courage and a natural satisfaction in assured prosperity, which would give peace in our time and for ever after.

The Unionists, I take it, are inspired by love of the Empire at large and of Old England in particular, a stern resolve to maintain the union by every means in their power, and an honourablr sense of duty to "the English Garrison." These ideals are admirable, but the world moves and they want revising. The Empire is great, and we hope immortal. But it can only survive if England is content to be the central unit of her daughter States, first among those who are her peers, and, in moral force, her equals. It is her glory that she governs her colonies in their interest not hers. She must better her own example by scrupulously limiting her leadership of the coming British Imperial Confederation. The first opportunity to show her recognition of this new obligation is to preserve the unity of the Empire by giving Ireland Home Rule, as completely as Canada or the Australian Commonwealth or New Zealand enjoys it to-day. Ireland, as she ought to be, great, glorious and free (from the private landowner) would be as loyal to the Empire as any of the three self-governing States I have named. Nor would there be the slightest fear for "The Garrison." It was long ago remarked that the air of Ireland turned the sturdiest Saxons into Irishmen—more Irish than the Irish themselves; and a happy country, busy with its new Lands Department and humming with money-making activities of every kind, would have no

time for persecution. Prosperity has a wonderfully soothing effect upon ancient grudges. The Orange and the Green are forces in the colonies to-day, but only by importation; the children of both go to school together and never learn the old world hates. If Ireland were as it ought to be "Ireland for the Irish," her people would be neither Orangemen nor Nationalists, but just Irishmen.

A. HENRY.

(*To be continued.*)

THE RIDDLE OF EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION.

The wisdom of Darwin's attitude toward the work of writers whose principles or standpoints were opposed to his own, is nowhere better exemplified than in his appreciation of Sir Charles Bell's attempt to grapple with the difficult problem of expression, and his protest against the neglect which Bell's work had suffered at the hands of foreign writers on the subject. Indeed the attitude of the evolutionist chief in this matter might, even to-day, well serve the cause of science if it warned some of his followers against too hasty a conclusion that Bell's suggestions on the subject of expression are already obsolete. This is by no means the case. On the contrary, the foundations for enquiry laid down by Sir Charles Bell appear to form the only basis upon which the problem of expression can ever be worked out to a satisfactory and strictly scientific solution.

As is well known, it was through working upon the knotty problem of expression that Sir Charles Bell came upon the discoveries which gave him the right of sharing with Majendie the great honour of putting science on the track of tracing the inward or centripetal tracts of nervous impulse in the animal body, and distinguishing them from the outward or centrifugal tracts. But the facts regarding centripetal nervous impulses which were acquired in Sir Charles' own day were too meagre to throw any convincing light on the problem of expression. Brilliant as was the pioneer work of this great physiologist in regard, for instance, to the centripetal nervous impulses from muscles, unless these impulses appeared to reach consciousness as sensations, Sir Charles saw no value in them, indeed he did not recognise them at all; no experiments had been performed in his time to show that centripetal impulses might make their way inward to nerve centres, and be of some value to the animal even if there was no possibility of them becoming sensations. And even more than half a century later, when Professor W. James followed in the path of Sir Charles Bell, and endeavoured to obtain from centripetal nervous phenomena some further light for the problem of expression, he also found no use, so far as concerned

this problem, for centripetal nervous impulses unless they came to the front door of consciousness with cards of introduction as sensations.

But I think it can be now made clear that we lose most valuable light for the old puzzle of expression by this limited appreciation of contripetal nervous impulses. Unfortunately, however, with the exception of the special senses, the centripetal arrangements of the nervous system are not matters of everyday knowledge, and are rarely referred to outside of strictly physiological writings.

Therefore a few technical generalities are necessary at the outset, even at the risk of thinning my audience.

For instance, attention must be called to the fact that all of us, indeed all animals, possess a greater number of ingoing than of outgoing paths for the conveying of nervous impulses; that besides the special sense channels, our internal organs, our skin, and every limb, muscle, tendon and joint in the body is so richly furnished with nerves for conveying ingoing impulses that every movement we make, voluntarily, or involuntarily, may contribute centripetal impulses to our nerve centres.

Now it is not only beyond question that these centripetal nerves exist, and are furnished with receiving organs (muscle spindles, organs of golgi, &c.) to pick up nervous impulses from movements of muscles, tendons and joints, but it is beyond question that they actually pick up and transmit these nervous impulses. It is proved that locomotion depends on the performance of these centripetal functions.

The mutual help arrangement that is maintained between antagonistic muscles by way of their centripetal nerves has been called reciprocal innervation.

It is, of course, out of the question to present in this article even a summary of the various illustrations and proofs advanced to show the reality of centripetal innervation. Numerous experiments have been performed specially for this purpose, other experiments illustrate it incidentally. Then there are cases of locomotor ataxia, and other nervous diseases, and even the various well-known phenomena of the long continued innervation of limbs that have been placed in a certain position during catalepsy and hypnotism, which illustrate the point. But probably the experiments of Verworn and Baglioni on strychnia convulsions most strikingly show the depth to which the principle of centripetal innervation is rooted in animal life, and its utter independence of volition or consciousness. According to the very extensive experiments of these physiologists, strychnia convulsions are prolonged, because the first twitch and each succeeding twitch causes centripetal nervous impulses to start from the moving muscles, tendons or joints, and pass inward to the centre to

initiate another twitch, which in its turn makes further ingoing impulses, and so on, until fatigue occurs.

Although attempts have been made to discount the very decisive results of these strychnia experiments, the general fact of centripetal innervation from both voluntary and involuntary movements can no longer be regarded as a controverted question; and the reader who is not satisfied with the above meagre indications on the point, must be referred to the physiological text books, while we pass on to consider the light which the broad principle of centripetal innervation throws on the old problem of expression, and the immensely interesting questions it raises.

Now when we see that even in extending an arm or a leg, animals cannot dispense with the nervous energy which passed inward from the flexing of the limb an instant before, we should be impelled to ask whether on occasion of urgency animals may not have some auxiliary means of obtaining an inward supply of nervous impulses. Besides the muscles, tendons, joints of the limb or limbs actually required in the action of the moment, do animals ever lay any other muscles under contribution? Is the principle of centripetal innervation of far wider scope than between flexor and extensor muscles? Is this principle so wide that muscles far distant from those employed in the action of the moment may be moved for the sake of the centripetal impulses thereby produced?

With this question in mind I watch an athlete finishing a race which he is winning easily. Roughly speaking, I detect no sign of him moving or contracting any muscles except those required in the act of locomotion. I watch him again finishing a race breast to breast with his competitor. In the latter case it is easy to observe the movement or contraction of muscles not actually required for the act of locomotion. It may be only a grin on his lips, a tighter clenching of his jaws. But these familiar movements will suffice to point the question: Are they unconsciously made for the sake of centripetal nervous impulses which they supply indirectly to the locomotor centres in the moment of emergency?

I again watch an animal rushing upon its prey. The act of locomotion is accompanied by a grin and a growl. I watch the hunted prey preparing to defend itself or to escape. I detect outward signs of certain muscles being moved besides those required for locomotion, or for the blow of its claws, or the snap of its jaws in battle—that is to say, I see the fearful and angry prey raise its hair or feathers, I hear it crying out.

Finally, in the heighth of amorous excitement in many animals, muscles of the head or face, that are not directly concerned in the business of reproduction, may be observed moving.

Now these and other movements, such as disturbances of the organ

of circulation and respiration, and of the vasomotor system, are already familiar to us as the characteristic emotional expressions of lower animals and man. And the questions I propose to put and answer regarding them are the following:

Besides making the very muscles that bend a limb contribute nerve impulses to the centre to help to extend it again, have animals organisms kept in touch with other available muscles to contribute nervous impulses to nerve centres? Have they for this purpose especially kept grip upon muscles that would interfere the least possible with the business of locomotion? Have they to some extent specialised these muscles, and parts attached to them, to become, some of them permanent, and some of them auxiliary, means of centripetal nerve supply?

To find an answer to these questions, let us first of all take muscular movements that are constant throughout life, and may be permanent sources of supply of centripetal nervous impulses, namely, visceral movements. Besides making the muscles, &c., of locomotion contribute centripetal nervous impulses to nerve centres, do animal organisms also make the viscera play an important rôle in the supply of centripetal nervous impulses, in addition to their respiratory, circulative and nutritive functions? This suggestion has bearings of medical import. Throughout the immense literature of the physiology of the viscera, an attentive ear will detect a wondering and uncertain tone regarding many visceral (especially cardiac) movements. But we must hasten on to consider that behaviour of the viscera which is the most constant mark of our own and all animal excitement. And the following questions may be put regarding this behaviour:

Is there anything to guide us toward ascertaining whether the familiar disturbance during excitement of the normal movements of the viscera is a result of these organs, and the muscular, tendinous, or osseous walls enclosing them, being compelled to move especially in the interest of supplying centripetal nervous impulses to the nerve centres? Is this the explanation of the familiar tightening at the pharynx, gasps for breath, &c., &c., in all powerful emotion, joyous or painful?

In answer to these questions comes first of all the guidance of anatomical facts, namely, the immense riches of the machinery of centripetal nerves, leading from the viscera of all animals. And besides the viscera themselves, the entire moving apparati of the thoracic and abdominal walls have their receiving arrangements for centripetal impulses, their muscle spindles, organs of golgi, &c.

Then comes the guidance of the physiological and psychological facts; it being entirely beyond question that nervous impulses make their way from the viscera to nerve centres. Besides the

physiological evidences on this point, the evidence of human experience is very weighty. Here we have the bodily or somatic feelings that give the psychologist the main elements out of which he builds up the empirical ego. And in pointing out that the stream of nervous impulses from the viscera to the nerve centres only occasionally emerges into consciousness as sensations, no psychologist ever suggested that this stream does not start until the instant these sensations arise, or that it ceases the instant they sink from consciousness again. There is everything to indicate that the stream keeps flowing continuously while life lasts. And most important of all comes evidences available from observation of the excited visceral movements themselves. We must note how animals have organised some of these movements in connection with minor disturbances, as the visceral movements of yawning, and also the visceral part of the movement of stretching. And in human life the visceral movements of laughter.

Then advancing to greater occasions of disturbance or shock, until we reach cases of extreme emergency when the central functions of the nervous system are in immediate danger of failing, what do we see?

Here the conflict between the interests of circulation, respiration, &c., and those other interests which we are trying to trace out, as belonging to visceral movements, becomes more and more violent according as the danger of central nervous failure increases. And what is the lesson taught by the ultimate behaviour of the muscles that normally work the viscera, and all the muscles and tendons, &c., of their enclosing walls?

The lesson is this. Whatever be the nature of the interest, apart from circulation, respiration, &c., which animals have in the movements of these muscles, *this interest becomes the prevailing one in extremity.* It bears every stamp of being the primary interest of muscular movement. In the extreme stages of central nervous failure, the interests of circulation and respiration have to give way to it. It may now assert itself with an utterly blind and elemental fatalism over all other interests of visceral movement, as in the convulsions that in higher developed animals produce asphyxia. And in extreme stages of central nervous failure, as is well known, the locomotor muscles, tendons, &c., may join those controlling the viscera in making convulsive movements; *then it* is significant that among the few experiments which have been successful in dodging the enormous difficulties of *testing the state* of nerve centres while animals are in convulsions, those of Verworn and Baglioni show that nerve energy passes inward *to nerve* centres in consequence of these convulsive movements.

So much at present for the viscera as a permanent source of

centripetal nerve energy, a source which is masked by other functions of the viscera in normal conditions, but which is to some extent unmasked during extreme excitement.

We may now pass on to note very briefly a permanent source of centripetal nerve energy which is not masked by the organs in question performing any other functions. I mean the source of centripetal nervous impulse in the semicircular canals and their lower analogues. As every one acquainted with the subject will admit, if there is a general point which has been clearly established above all the mysteries surrounding the functions of the semicircular canals, it is that they contribute centripetal nervous impulses to nerve centres. But the centripetal functioning of the semicircular canals is not obviously affected by excitement, and therefore they are, of course, never placed among the means of expression of excitement.

Let us next approach what may be called the auxiliary sources of supply of centripetal nervous impulses, namely, the movement of muscles which remain more or less quiescent in normal conditions, but which may come into action on occasion of shock or excitement. The most important of these are the muscles of the sound-producing apparati of animals, both stridulatory and vocal, muscles already to some extent brought into action by excited visceral or other movement. Only in the case of sound-production it is not only the centripetal nerves of the moving muscles that conduct the nervous impulses inward. Here we have a centripetal channel of a very high order, namely, that of audition. And the way in which animals have taken advantage of this inward channel for the business of centripetal stimulation is witnessed by the development of music in both lower animals and man, and the development of language in man.

The second great auxiliary source of centripetal supply of nervous impulses in excitement is that of the pilomotor and facial muscles, and the muscles of the hands. And here, again, as in the case of sound-production, these movements are connected with centripetal channels of a higher order than those of muscle spindles or organs of golgi, namely, the channels of the tactile sense which are so richly supplied to the face and hands.

In the case of these various auxiliary muscles and apparati for the supply of centripetal stimuli, it may be noted that as the more highly developed receiving organs in the skin, and in the cochlea, are here available, the muscles of the face, and also of the larynx, are not so richly endowed with muscle spindles as other muscles, indeed some physiologists (Sherrington in England, Cipollone in Germany) have announced their failure to find any muscle spindles at all in many of the muscles of facial expression.

We may now venture a step closer to the most interesting aspects of the old riddle of expression, and note that various needs and circumstances of life in different families and classes of animals have affected the use of development of the auxiliary arrangements for centripetal supply of nervous energy.

Let us take that distinction in habits of expression between carnivorous and plant-eating animals which has always proved the greatest of the many puzzles of lower animal expression. Who was ever satisfied that the difference between biting herbs and biting living prey accounted for the differences in the behaviour of the muscles of the head and face in the carnivora and herbivora, to say nothing of the vocal differences in these animals?

But from our standpoint we must see that the constant dangers involved in the hunt for, and battle with, prey, bring repeated and sudden calls for increased centripetral supplies of nervous impulses to the carnivora. Thus the machinery of supply starts to action at any moment on the slightest cause; it may be always more or less in motion in the waking hours of these animals. The constant movement of this machinery gives the carnivora their character. The grin and snarl of ferocity is always ready to supply a share of the centripetral impulses required for the actions of battle and slaughter, upon which the obtaining of food depends.

On the other hand, the animals that obtain their food from plants have no such sudden calls for auxiliary centripetal supplies of nervous impulses, hence their "meek" character; the machinery of contripetal nervous supply only getting into motion in the last extremity of danger.

Coming now to the immense uses man has made of what we have called, from our standpoint, the auxiliary sources of centripetal supply of nervous impulses, it may be noted that with lower animals it is, generally speaking, only when shock overtakes them, or special life-caring efforts are required, that the auxiliary sources of centripetal supply, in vocal, pilomotor, and facial, muscles are called upon. But in the case of man we have to face a great structure of habits that has been built up upon these auxiliary sources. For example, the habits of human emotion, will, language, memory, and thought. A man's use of voice, gesture, and facial expression is as constant as his use of these habits. Passing over, as, of course, is inevitable as far as this article is concerned, the profoundly interesting question of the manner in which man made the auxiliary sources of the centripetal supply of nervous impulses lead him on gradually to the development of human emotion, will, language, memory, and thought, we may take these habits in their fully developed state, and still compel them to reveal at least a glimpse of the secret of their origin.

You are, let us suppose, an orator making a speech. Never mind for the moment the deeper grounds of the processes of thought and memory and language within you; but note that your ear, the centripetal nerves (organs of touch) of your face, and hands, are all, so to speak, subscription plates held out for contributions toward the central fund of nervous energy. And contributions are picked up from every contraction of your brow, every pursing or compression of your lips, every wave of your arm, every clenching of your hands, no less than from the sounds of your words. It is, however, no more necessary that these tiny streamlets of centripetal nerve energy should appear in consciousness than it would be necessary that the athlete should be aware each time he bends a limb of the centripetal nervous impulses which passed inward from the movement, and helped to extend it again.

Or take a case where the significant uses of the gestures made are less intentional than those of the orator, namely, in the case of any suddenly conveyed incitement to amazement, admiration, or even abhorrence.

It need no longer puzzle us that these gestures might be made as strenuously in the dark and in perfect solitude as when in the light of day and in the presence of others. The centripetal nerves of the raised arms and hands, and the delicate receiving organs of the facial nerves pick up nervous impulses from these movements and transmit them inward to nerve centres that had just suffered a slight shock from the object of amazement, admiration, or abhorrence.

It must be admitted, of course, that every possible movement of voice, lips, eyes and hands, has become significant. And the value of these movements to convey meaning may entirely mask their primary centripetal values. But the mask can be torn away by many very simple experiments. If you are what is called a "sensitive" or "nervous" person, an uncontrollable impulse often comes to your hands, fingers, lips, brows, eyes, to make some "nervous" movement—a movement of some of the machinery of expression. You are most keenly aware of the impulse, and precisely because of the communicative aspects of the threatened gesture, because it will betray your emotion, you try, and, may be, succeed in suppressing it. But if you carefully note what has really happened, you will find that instead of entirely suppressing the movement your act of will merely transferred it from one part of the machinery of expression to the other—probably to a part whose movements are less visible. You may suppress a contraction of the brow, to find that at the same moment you have, however, slightly accented the closure of the lips or jaws—and *vice versâ*. You may unclench your teeth to find that, at the same instant, you clenched your

hands. You may again unclench both fingers and teeth, and find that some part of the viscera, or their walls, at the same instant, backed your act of will with a barely perceptible spasm, and so on.

In short, the entire machinery of human expression in voice, face and hands, with its infinite varieties and complexities of movement appear primarily as the sources of supply of centripetal nervous impulses, not only for emotion, but also for the actions of will, memory and thought. The streams of nervous impulse from this machinery, however, rarely impinges upon consciousness, and therefore these streams are easily masked by the great communicative values of the movements that produce them.

J. Donovan.

CAN AMERICAN DEMOCRACY BE REGENERATED?

I. The Conditions.

The last third of a century has been characterised by a remarkable growth in the wealth of the United States, and by a still more remarkable concentration of wealth in the hands of a few individuals. The figures which measure the wealth produced by the intelligent toil of American citizens are almost fabulous, yet no one can travel through that country without noting that the improvement in the condition of the agricultural sections and among the labouring men has not kept pace with America's increasing wealth. The wealth has been produced, it has been created; but who owns it? Never before in the history of the States have the earnings of those who labour been so unequally and inequitably distributed. In fact, the vast majority of ordinary labourers have so little laid up that they are practically dependent upon their daily wages for their daily bread; and even skilled labourers have little to their credit compared with the accumulations of the so-called "captains of industry." The Homestead strike, which occurred just after the Presidential nominations of 1892, forced President Harrison to admit, with a pathetic reluctance, that "capital sometimes takes too large a share of the profits."

No patent remedy will check the tendency of rich and poor to drift apart. People who can afford it will always live in such houses as suit them, while other people will always put up with such houses as they can afford. Money will always tend to make available certain social opportunities which are not consistent with a pressing lack of money. Where the rich and poor can best get in touch with one another is in their work. In the public schools various interests bring all grades and conditions of students into relations of competitive or co-operative work, promoting friendship by an automatic process; and in the outside world every sort of business breeds comradeship.

It has, however, come to a point in the United States of America, where money has got to do better than it used to think necessary, if it is to command esteem. A great deal has happened in the ast few years to bring excessive money-making into contempt.

The methods by which men have been getting rich and by which some rich men have been getting richer have been overhauled, exposed and damned with a publicity that has been impressive. The aggregate character of the group of persons who represent America's wealth has been seriously damaged.

II. Socialism Unreasonable as a Remedy.

Socialism, like other great single names for complex things, stands for a wide diversity of doctrine and purpose. But the best definition seems to be that "in general it has for its end the destruction of inequalities in social condition by an economic transformation." The gradual smoothing of revolutionary Socialism into what has been called electoral or parliamentary Socialism may have chilled the old, high order of an earlier apostolate. Yet the central aim and principle abide—subordination of individual energy and freedom, not merely to social ends, but to more or less rigorous social direction. This marks a vast difference, and is a dividing line that divides the reasonable from the narrow—the wise from the foolish.

According to this standard the democratic elements are gradually left out or thrust into obscurity, the free spontaneous moral forces are pooh-poohed, and all interest is concentrated on some machinery by which life is to be organised. Everything is to fall into the hands of an expert, who will sit in an office and direct the course of the world. A harder, more unsympathetic, more mechanical conception of society has seldom been devised.

When the declaration of the Rights of Man sprang into flame it became the beacon-light of continental democracy in Europe. No set of propositions framed by human ingenuity and zeal have ever let loose more swollen floods of sophism, fallacy, cant and rant than that declaration. Yet the French declaration held saving doctrine, vital truths and quickening fundamentals. Party names fade, forms of words grow hollow, and the letter kills; but what was true in spirit lived on, because the world's circumstances needed and demanded it.

The vast majority of American citizens are labourers, and yet to-day their interests are misrepresented by those who are supposed to legislate in their interests. Never was living higher and wages lower. Never were salaries larger and wealth more oppressive. What has brought about this condition of things? Is there something insidiously creeping into the economic system of the United States? The peasants of France—the real population of that nation—rebelled against a class distinction and a rotten system of aristocracy. Does not a class of distinction face the American people to-day?

United States business in the main does not like Socialism, and there is no doubt that it is somewhat uneasy over the many leadings in that direction—such as the success of the municipal ownership ticket in Chicago two years ago, the big vote for Hearst in New York last fall, the insistently growing demand for governmental control of various things that touch nearly the whole body of the people, like railroad rates and life insurance. In fact it is easy to point out, especially among urban phenomena, many indications that policies which are at least theoretically Socialistic are finding wider acceptance in the United States. But what has created this demand for public ownership?

III. The Trusts are the Blameable Institutions.

Private monopolies of any articles or means sustenant to life is indefensible. Nearly all the so-called trusts are over-capitalised and rely upon their control of the market to collect dividends, and besides this they are constantly narrowing the field of independent enterprise.

The wrong that the trusts may do and can do to the consumers of trust-made goods is only a small part of the injury. The extortion which is measured by the enhancement of the price of the product is distributed over the whole country, each person suffering more or less in proportion to his purchases. But the injury done to independent producers is more severe, because it often wipes out the entire savings and capital of the small competitor. The injury done in closing the door of opportunity and in discouraging the spirit of enterprise among young and active business men is even more damaging to the nation, and the political dangers that follow in the wake of an industrial despotism are more menacing still. It is impossible for a Government to rest fully and firmly upon the consent of the governed under an industrial system wherein a few moneyed magnates mete out daily bread to the millions who labour.

Mr. Roosevelt, at bottom, is fighting the battle of democracy against plutocracy. To that aim his trust policy, his railway policy, his pleas for tariff revision, are ultimately referable. He is a Bryanite without Mr. Bryan's genius. Both men press towards the same goal—the release of America from the grip of organised wealth and the disruption of that unholy alliance between the millionaire and the boss, between a voracious plutocracy and a conscienceless political leadership. And Mr. Roosevelt is finding now, as Mr. Bryan may find hereafter in pursuing that objective, that the Senate is of all obstacles the most formidable and persistent, because it is itself the very citadel of "vested interests," the chosen instrument

of the machine and the trusts. Between Mr. Roosevelt and the Senate there is not merely a want of personal congruity, not merely the normal constitutional jealousy, but a basic divergence of political outlook and tendency. He will strive and strive again to bend it not to his but to the national will. But if anything could make Mr. Roosevelt, pause from doing what he feels to be right it would be the thought of how many Presidents have essayed the same task and how few have been successful.

These ever larger and ever more frequent strikes in the great concentrated industries in all parts of the world—strikes of labour against capital, strikes of capital against labour—are revealing to the most thoughtless how science, which has created concentration of industry, has compelled concentration of all the forces of society, has made the theoretical brotherhood of man—that is, the mutual interdependence of all men—a prosaic fact. We must have the railway, the telegraph, the newspaper and the magazine, the electric light, the street car, the combinations for delivering all the necessities of civilised life to us. We are dependent upon them. We cannot, therefore, afford to disregard the rights of those who serve us. Every man is to-day a cog in the great co-ordination of wheels, and no human being can afford to cause friction with his brother man. Mutual dependence is the iron law. They are wise who recognise and accept it. They are unwise who refuse to see it.

OWEN E. MCGILLICUDDY.

THE STATE AND SECONDARY EDUCATION.

SLOWLY, very slowly, we are awakening to the fact that the education problem is a much more serious one than it at first appeared when Carlyle said, "Get the people taught a little."

We are beginning to recognise that vast issues are involved, and, impressed with the magnitude of the task of educating the nation, we are convinced of the necessity of framing a system which shall not be open to the reproach contained in Huxley's dictum that "We get our learning by making mistakes." For the education of a people connotes something more, and something far higher, than the mere supplying of information; although information of the right kind, rightly applied, is no unworthy object of our endeavour.

A false step in education has far-reaching effects, and the task of unlearning is far more difficult than that of learning.

To the uninitiated a good building with good apparatus appears to be the prime factor of the school; but the expert knows that "Such as the teacher is, so is the school," that the best teacher is *nascitur, non fit*, but that good teachers may be produced by a wise system of training, and that even the born teacher is better for the study of the theory and practice of his forebears.

We are not specially concerned at the present with the professional side of this question, but rather with its social or national aspect. All classes of the community are more or less convinced that the nation which is educated is calculated to live a more human life than an uneducated one, and that the conditions of modern life, looked at from an international point of view, demand education as a fundamental condition of existence. In this sense the term education is limited to training in school or college, and does not include the education of experience in the school of life. We might almost say we have reached the conclusion that the school is a greater factor in human life than it has been considered hitherto, and we have therefore by a series of enactments made elementary education both compulsory and free. We have, further, experimented with evening classes, which we fondly hoped would supply technical knowledge to make up for the loss of the training which was formerly given, before apprenticeship became a thing of the past. But the heads of technical schools and classes, generally

speaking, have been compelled sorrowfully to report that the raw material was not in a fit state for the manufacture of captains and leaders of industry, and that the great majority of the pupils in evening classes were engaged in renewing acquaintance with the three R's, which they had so successfully forgotten.

Gradually it dawned upon administrators and teachers that it was impossible to produce good results under such conditions, and that it was unwise to expect even the bright pupils who were fit to acquire elementary technical knowledge to work in the evenings after a day at the desk or the bench, when their natural instinct led them to look for evening recreation rather than work.

Then followed the fuller light showing clearly that a technical education which would develop the captain of industry, the budding inventor, and the organiser of industry or commerce, must be based upon a thorough secondary education, which could not possibly be obtained before the average age of sixteen. It was this knowledge, slowly acquired, that led to the demand for a State system of secondary education; and the demand has been supported almost as much on moral as on educational grounds, for it is evident that the most impressionable age, when character is largely influenced by environment, lies somewhere between the ages of twelve and seventeen, and hence arose the wish to keep hold of the children during their most impressionable years. From many points of view this is sound doctrine, but the position which it postulates requires careful examination. It is obvious that any such national system applied to all of school age would cost an enormous sum of money. According to Mr. Lough, we are already spending thirty-two millions a year on education, and it is safe to say that a State system of free secondary and higher education would double this sum. Would such an expenditure prove to be a paying investment? It is admitted by all disinterested experts that our expenditure on elementary education is not effective.

The president of the Association of Directors and Secretaries for Education, in his presidential address, on January 2, 1906, said:

> "Now to come to the schools themselves. What is the present condition of the teaching in our elementary schools? Can it be considered satisfactory? I think not; far from it. Many children, I believe a not inconsiderable percentage, now leave our elementary schools unable to read and write—I mean, to read and write fairly—and unable to perform the simplest problems in arithmetic. This statement I make with due deliberation."

Mr. E. Gray, himself an ex-elementary teacher, secretary of the Education Committee of the National Union of Elementary Teachers, and formerly Member of Parliament for West Ham, has said: "Twenty-five years of error had to be undone. One generation had been turned out who would be a drag on educational machinery for

years; who had learned one lesson, and that—to hate school and all its works."

Yet in spite of this failure the Trades Union Congress at Liverpool carried a resolution, a few only dissenting, demanding State maintenance of school children, skilled medical attendance for any child, a free and secular system of education from the primary school to the university, *secondary and technical education to be an essential part of every child's education*, the cost of all education, including the training of teachers, to be borne by the Imperial Exchequer.

Neglecting for the moment the failure of our State system of elementary education, and assuming for argument's sake, the value of a general State system of secondary education, it is plain that in order to provide trained teachers for a wholesale supply of secondary and higher schools there must first of all be established a large number of training colleges, and that in order to induce the most able men and women to take up the work of secondary teachers the conditions of service must be made more attractive—very much better salaries paid, and probably a scheme of superannuation. Every educationist worthy the name is persuaded on these points. Can the necessary expenditure be justified on national grounds?

Let us look for a moment at the professional aspect of the question. Are all children capable of receiving and of benefiting by a secondary education? It is safe to say that not 5 per cent. of the children in elementary schools would benefit by a secondary school course, and it would be nothing less than cruel to urge the great majority to over-work their weak brains, and not less cruel to give false notions of life to those who might work through such a course only to find ultimately that it is the few who will be captains and leaders, and that manual labour or clerical work of a monotonous type is the only reward for all their strenuous efforts. A considerable percentage of the children of the middle and upper classes of society receive very little benefit from a lengthened stay at school, and it is no uncommon thing to-day to find them competing with young people from a humbler social grade for inferior positions. This fact alone is sufficient to show that education is not a class question, and that it is a matter of the survival of the fit.

The idea of Locke that the mind of a child is a *tabula rasa* has been shown long ago to be the very opposite of the truth, and every student of biology is well aware that heredity is a far more potent factor in education than an acquired character due to the provision of an environment.

Dr. Saleeby has conclusively demonstrated the truth of this statement in his lectures delivered for the British Constitutional Association.

We may therefore say that it is not practicable from the teacher's standpoint to give to every child a secondary education, and that therefore the State would not be justified in spending millions of pounds annually in an attempt to fight nature or to make water flow uphill. In other words, it is not wise to buy a costly hydraulic press to try to force a quart of water into a pint cup. Coming now to the small percentage who would be benefited, we shall see at a glance that the parents of the poor children would be unable to pay the cost of the education, so that the whole cost would be thrown upon the State, and that something more would be required than the supply of free education, for a very large percentage of parents would require a sustentation grant towards the cost of food and clothing. Relatively few of the working classes could afford to keep their children even at a *free* secondary school up to the age of sixteen or seventeen. Here we are confronted with a great question of principle. Shall the State stand *in loco parentis*? It may be argued that this difficulty has been faced in the United States of America and in other countries. But would all English parents agree with Professor Jenks of Cornell University when he says:

"That the services of individuals and of the State are reciprocal, and that if private individuals are to receive their education at the hands of the State the public should receive an equivalent service in return. It is extremely desirable that the individual recipient of this [State] education should recognise his obligations to the State therefor."

Of this last proposition it is somewhat remarkable that the Professor is obliged to admit, in America "I fear at the present time that it is not very common." Would it be more common in England?

But a greater than Professor Jenks, John Stuart Mill, a former Editor of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW, has told us in his essay on Liberty:

"That the whole or any large part of the education of the people should be in State hands I go as far as anyone in deprecating. All that has been said of the importance of individuality of character and diversity in opinions and modes of conduct involves, as of the same unspeakable importance, diversity of education. A general State education is a mere contrivance for moulding people to be exactly like one another; in proportion as it is efficient and successful, it establishes a despotism over the mind, leaning by natural tendency to one over the body. An education established and controlled by the State should only exist, if it exist at all, as one among many competing experiments, carried on for the purpose of example and stimulus, to keep the others up to a certain standard of excellence."

Thring, the founder of the Headmasters' Conference, and perhaps the greatest modern pioneer of educational progress, was opposed to any and every attempt on the part of the State to organis econdary education—"to that dead hand of outside power thrus

into the heart-strings of a living work"—which he felt to be fatal to progress.

Huxley, the chief promoter of technical education in England, wrote: "As to intermediate education, I have never favoured the notion of State intervention in this direction"; the result of the State "meddling with education" would be that education would become "fossilised."

An even more weighty, because more representative, pronouncement than any of these is found in the report of the Royal Commission which dealt with the whole question in the fullest possible manner in 1895. We may gather their opinion from the following quotations:

"In regard to the provision of secondary schools, the first principle should be to utilise every existing element of the supply which is (or can be made) good of its kind. It will be desirable, for example, to utilise all those private schools (but those alone) which are really efficient and which accept the public test of efficiency. There is an almost universal agreement among our witnesses that it would be a misfortune if good private and proprietary schools were to cease to exist, that they are doing much good work, that they fill a place which cannot be altogether taken by public schools, and that they ought therefore to be reckoned as part of the educational supply of the country. So far from desiring to displace, or even to weaken, such schools as these, we trust that some of the measures we recommend may tend to stimulate and improve them, and the only State interference to which, as we think, they ought to be liable is that which needs to be enforced in the interests of health by way of inspecting their buildings and schoolrooms."

"New public schools should be founded only to supply distinct deficiencies. Where it can be shown that private or proprietary schools sufficiently provide for any educational need of a district, the local authority should not compete with them."

It is no answer to such deliberate recommendations for the present Minister of Education to say that "nobody ever reads the reports of Royal Commissions." We entirely agree with him in his later pronouncement when he says that "the education question is one of the gravest problems of our time," and it is not only a matter of common sense, but it is absolutely necessary in the best interests of the nation, that effect should be given to the well-weighed utterances of some of the nation's greatest thinkers and greatest educational authorities.

H. R. Beasley.

THOUGHT: CONSCIOUSNESS: LIFE.

A REPLY.

Probably no one will question the statement of Sir Edward Fry, in his article contributed under the above title to the *Contemporary Review*, of February, that bile and thought are entirely dissimilar products.

But although the analogy between bile as secreted by the liver, and thought as evolved by the brain, does not hold good in all their relations, every logically-minded reader will find it impossible to believe that in the molecular action of the brain which is the inevitable concomitant of the evolution of thought in this life, there is not involved an expenditure of vital force, equivalent to the elements abstracted in the process of thinking, from the sub-psychic forces which supplied it. The reasons in support of this inference, present themselves in a crowd.

(1) Immediately the blood supply to the brain is arrested, thought and all conscious function become suspended, as shown in fainting. The most powerful electrical stimulation will not evoke any functional response from a brain from which the blood-supply is withdrawn. (2) Intense and sustained thought has a most exhausting effect upon the vital functions. That hard, consecutive thinking uses up the vitality rapidly, all great thinkers tell us is their experience. The Polish poet Mickiewiez wrote his "Conrad" without interruption in one night, but, when he had finished it, he sank unconscious from his chair. Indeed, nervous dyspepsia seems to be the frequent *bête noir* of great thinkers—Carlisle and Lamb are conspicuous examples. (3) In nervous dyspepsia the patient experiences an overwhelming tide of heterogeneous, inchoate thoughts, due to the irritability and loss of tone in the brain; and then, as the digestive organs collapse suddenly into functional abeyance, there is a drought of thought as abnormal as the previous inundation—only a few gloomy thoughts evolved with difficulty. There are people whose digestion is so straitened that they are painfully conscious of the cost to their digestive functions of every thought they think, and every vibration of emotion they experience. Directly the digestion is seriously arrested, thought stagnates, showing an involuntary tendency to dwell fixedly on the same topic, or to fall back upon the past, showing that the nutrition of the

brain, including the thought-centres, is one with that of the vital organs, and that only *pari passu* with theirs can its functions keep step with the forward motion of the sum of things. Christ, who understood all things, fed the multitude first, and preached to them afterwards; he knew that starving brains could not benefit by abstract instruction. (4) In the inhibition of the thought-centres of the brain in hypnotism, the vital forces can be focalised in any point of the organism, at the suggestion of the operator, showing that they (the vital forces) are no longer being assimilated to the thought equation by them (the thought-centres). (5) The inhibition of the thought-centres in anæsthetisation, causes the most serious functional revulsion in the system, rendering the patient sick, and the victim of painful anorexia for days, by the wholesale precipitation of the vital currents which were ascending into the thought-centres, and higher emotional centres, for active expenditure by them, back into the emotio-automatic centres and vital organs in a deluge, owing to the suspended functional action of the centres of ideation and higher emotion. (6) When the thinking and feeling functions of the brain become impaired by age, the vitality not being sublimated in the same degree to higher forms, *i.e.*, anabolically metabolised, becomes relatively katabolic, and all the textures of the system which are being renewed from it consequently degenerate piecemeal. It is very common to hear people say, "as my health improved, my mental status declined," or, "as my mind improved, my health became worse." This demonstrates the imminent interdependence between the mental and physical functions, and the interchangeability of their energies.

"Thought you can neither see nor handle, nor has it any physical or chemical qualities. If the brain does secrete thought, then you have this strange conclusion, that a physical thing can secrete a non-physical thing, and such a process is a very different one from the secretion by a physical thing of another physical thing. Certainly the brain does not secrete thought as—in the same manner as—the liver secretes bile," says Sir Edward Fry.

"Cogito ergo sum," said Descartes, "I think, therefore I am."

I have read many interpretations of that celebrated postulate, but my own opinion is that the truth that was haunting the mind of Descartes, though he may not have fully realised it himself, is that only so long as an individual can generate objective abstract selves, *i.e.*, thoughts, is he a self-conscious identity. That is to say, the ideational or thought—*i.e.*, abstract offspring of my identity is the basis, the source of that identity, and only so long as such offspring are issuing into being from it, does it retain independent identity. The thought which is the ideal reflex of the sum total of the activities of my organism, is in some way the source or cause as well as the product of those activities. Certainly, self-consciousness

ceases immediately the organism ceases to be *en rapport* with its own thoughts; so that thought has the dual property of being objective to the organised potential consciousness from which it is evolving, *i.e.*, being projected, and also the basis of its subjectivity; just as, during the birth-process, a mother is subjectively and objectively conscious of her offspring. Hence, as a person is a man physically only so long as he is potentially capable of begetting physical offspring, so is he a self-conscious, *i.e.*, self-identifying personality only so long as he is actually generating abstract offspring, *i.e.*, thoughts.

This view is further supported by the fact that thought is always the ideational reflex or mirror of the sum total of the functional relations existing in the organism at the moment of its evolution, so that, *what* we think, *that* we are. Dr. Adam Clarke, for example, died of cholera, before death from which the patient is usually cyanosed, and his last words were "am I blue?"

Thought being such an ideal or highly sublimated form of functional force, can only be directly ideally perceived, that is, self-perceived, being too ethereal to be cognisable through the senses by which it is brought into relation with concrete phenomena, the intervention of such sensational media are not necessary to its self-perception, they (the senses) being lower relations of thought to itself.

Thought must possess very powerful physical and chemical properties potentially, otherwise it could not be assimilated to the abstract counterparts of such properties, through which potentiality we are alone enabled to understand them, by assimilating ourselves through our thought to abstract counterparts of their equations: thought is thus the potentially all-inclusive force or energy, but it must possess very powerful chemical properties or the equivalent of them, as a flame has of the elements of whose decomposition it is the resultant, though too refined to admit of tangible demonstration as ordinary chemical reactions. It is in sense to speak of mordant forms of thought, of burning thought, and writers use such metaphors, as when George Eliot tells us that "Tito Melema's thought showed itself active as a virulent acid, eating its way through all the tissues of sentiment."

The analogy between thought and a flame seems to hold good in many particulars. The flame holds in reactive affinity the elements of combustion with those which support the combustion; so thought seems to be the living link between the potential psychic forces into which the thought-centres of the brain convert the vital forces they are assimilating from the organism, and the actual psychic atmosphere with which, through those centres, it holds the entire organism *en rapport*. Further, just as the flame once kindled, compels the elements with which it is *en rapport*, to

feed and support its existence so long as there are any to draw upon, so thought controls and dominates the forces which sustain its existence. If thought and flame were not *sui generis* in relation to the elements they feed upon by conversion into themselves, they could not so dominate and control them. This fact settles for ever the vexed question as to whether the brain thinks or the mind, *i.e.*, thought, plays upon it as an operator upon an instrument, for, if thought were not an entity *per se*, objective to the brain, how could it control the brain, and through it the entire system? "What do we do with this nervous system?" asked a man of a class of boys to whom he was showing a diagram of the nervous system *in situ*. "What do we do with this nervous system?" said a small boy at the bottom of the class. "Why, we do as we like with it!" The teacher saw that it was a clever answer, but not the extent of psychological truth that it covered.

Though the equivalent of the elements which the flame is living by decomposing are recoverable by the chemist, yet flame is an entity *per se*, with properties *sui generis*, distinct in character from the elements it uses, and from those into which it converts them, and it *is* the resultant of the chemical reaction and decomposition of those elements, they do bear the relation of cause and effect by reason of the dependence for existence of the flame on the supply of tangible elements, and it may be that thought is one with the luminous phosphorescence into which the brain elaborates subluminous forms of vitality, in which case it *is ejusdem generis* with its physical cause.

Thought seems to be an ideal, abstract, luminous reflex of the vital and mental functionalities held by it in reaction with some purely psychic atmosphere—the total soul-side of universal nature. Hence, the analogy between breathing and thought seems closer than between thought and the secretion of bile by the liver. As we cannot breathe without changing the ærial atmosphere and being changed by it—oxygenation we call it—so we cannot think without changing the psychic atmosphere and being changed by it—psychogenation it might be called. In the physiology of breathing two independent entities are interoperative, but they act in accordance with the universal and undeviating law of cause and effect, the whole system being related through the lung-cells to the air, and the air to it. This suggests that as breathing life ceases immediately the lungs fail to respond to the stimulus of the air, so consciousness ceases as soon as the ideational, *i.e.*, thought-centres of the brain cease to respond to the stimulus of some psychic atmosphere, to which they are co-related, but which is too subtle to admit of sensational demonstration as does the ærial atmosphere.

Thought appears to be the supremely subliminal point in the circle of inter-dependent functions which constitute personality so

long as they are *en rapport* with their own ideational reflex, *i.e.*, the thought-flame into which they are being assimilated by the thought-centres of the brain, towards which, during self-consciousness, they are flowing up, ascending. When Sir Humphrey Davy was partially under an anæsthetic, he exclaimed, "Nothing exists but ideas and sensations."

Mr. Herbert Spencer speaks of "the science of mind which, through an undeterminate region, passes into the science of being; if we can call that a science of which the end is nescience." He appears to mean that thought is unknowable in essence. And in this tremendous paradox, one of those which truth is constantly presenting by reason of the fact that it is conditioned by super-terrestrial relations, we see that thought, which is the basis and scource of all our knowledge of tangible forms of itself, is so transcendental as to elude direct apprehension by those tangible forms.

"No idea can be more erroneous than that which supposes the dignity and future destiny of man to depend of necessity on the substance of which he is made," says Mr. George Combe, the eminent psycho-physiologist.

And further, the same writer remarks:

"Some authors make materialism the foundation of atheism, and wish us to believe that the best evidence of the divine intention in creating the human soul, is to be found in discovering the *substance* of which it is made; and they insinuate that if it be constituted of a very refined and dignified material, it must be designed for magnificent destinies; while, if it be composed of rude and vulgar stuff, it must be intended to live only in the lower world. Here, however, sense and logic equally fail them; for no principle in philosophy is more certain than that, from a knowledge of the mere substance of any thing, we cannot infer what ends it is fitted to subserve. Exhibit to a human being every variety of imaginable essence, and if you allow him to know no more of its properties than he can discover by examining its elements, he will be utterly incapable of telling whether it is calculated to endure only for a day, or to last to eternity. The materialist, therefore, is not entitled, even from the supposed admission that medullary matter thinks, to conclude that the human being cannot possibly be immortal. The true way of discovering for what end man has been called into existence, is to look to the *faculties* with which he has been endowed, trusting that the substance of which he is composed is perfectly adapted to the objects of his creation. When we inquire into the faculties, we find that they differ, not only in *degree*, but in *kind*, from those of the lower animals. The latter have no faculty of justice to indicate to them that the unrestrained manifestation of Destructiveness or Acquisitiveness is wrong; they have no sentiment of Veneration, prompting them to seek a God whom they may adore; they have no faculty of Hope, pointing out futurity as an object of ceaseless interest and contemplation; and their understanding is so limited as to be satisfied with little knowledge, and to be insensible to the comprehensive design and glories of creation. Man, then, being endowed with qualities which are denied to the lower creatures, we are entitled by a legitimate exercise of *reflection*, the subject being beyond the region of the external senses, to

conclude that he is designed for another and a higher destiny than is allotted to them, whatever be the *essence* of his mind."

It is in the utterances of "the sage poets, taught by the heavenly muse," who see truth from a higher conscious vantage, and hence perceive far higher relations of it than average mortals, that we find insuperable logical implication of the essential immortality of man. The following, which Milton puts into the mouth of Satan, for example, is a highly focalised teleological demonstration of the immortality of thought.

> "For who would lose, though full of pain, this intellectual being?
> Those thoughts that wander through eternity," &c.

Now, if thought can "wander through eternity," and we know that the farthest star or the body of the thinker are objectively equally near to thought unconditioned by the senses; and we know of no form of existence which it cannot assume as an abstract conception, it becomes an inevitable corollary that, whatever thought be in essence, it must be eternal in its relation to existence.

To paraphase the line

> "Those thoughts that wander through eternity;"

as thought is the basis and sum of self-consciousness, it might correctly be rendered, "Those selves through which the Eternal Self wanders eternally through itself."

It looks as though thought were the result of the abstract side of the universe as reflected in the attributes of concrete phenomena, reacting upon itself as reflected in its personified epitome man, by assimilating him through the thought-centres of his brain, to an ideal equation, as he assimilates it; for all thought is a dual process of resolving (resolution) of concrete into abstract attributes, commencing in the senses, and culminating in ideas. Thus, food is tasted through the palate, *i.e.*, sensational impression, and resolved through thought into its attributes of sharpness, or flatness, insipidity, hardness, fluidity, &c., &c. If the function of the thought-centres be suspended, as in hypnotism, such attributive discrimination by the organs of the senses is impossible. The food is ingested and metabolised through the complex laboratory of the organism, until ultimately translated into potential thinking-power in the thought-centres of the brain, from which it issues by becoming *en rapport* through the external senses of sight, hearing, touch, smell, and taste, with the attributes of external phenomena to which it is prerelated as thought.

For does not all perception and intelligent cognisance of phenomena consist in resolving them into their attributes, which are

abstractions, and tracing the connected co-relations and combinations of those attributes?

CONSCIOUSNESS.

I am a thought; a myriad forces plying,
Evolve an ego, an identity:
Each moment I'm begotten, born, and dying,
Each a new *I*, and yet 'tis always *me*.

What am I then, who thus am ever changing?
I was, I am not, yet I always be?
Legions of cells their aspects re-arranging,
Evolve a changed and changeless entity.

The mystery of identity is the mystery of the retention of the sense of sameness of personality with perpetual change of it.

Mind and body change *pari passu*; there cannot be the slightest change in the mind, without its concomitant change in the whole physical organism, and though the changes seem simultaneous, the mental functions are the primary source of their realisation, even though the exciting cause may be physical, for, in proportion as the mental parts of the brain are inert, all physiological action, *i.e.*, functional and organic change, is slow.

Apart from the cases of morbid manifestation of self-consciousness due to disease, such as duality of personality, in which the person becomes alternately two distinct selves without knowledge or memory of each other; and the change of personality inducible by hypnotism; the strongly dissimilar moods and phases of character displayed by powerful and active temperaments, as well as the gradual changes due to age, appear to be only less extreme phases of the same psycho-physiological susceptibilities as the former. Persons with large and active brains of unstable functional equilibrium due to physical disease, display extravagant changes of disposition, amounting almost to insanity, and impelling them to do in one mood actions which in another are so impossible to them that they cannot understand how they could have perpetrated them. Yet, as Russell Lowell has said, "it is only fools and the dead who never change." For although fluctuations of thought and feeling when too exorbitant, constitute disease, it is in change, variation, reaction, that self-conscious life intrinsically consists.

As we advance in life, while retaining the sense of being a continuation of our original self, we are not only conscious of being an entirely different self from what we were at the stages and periods through which we have passed, by bearing at each a different relation to ourselves, and through ourselves to our objective environment, but conscious also that under different conditions of environment, we must have been quite different individuals from what we are; as Mr. Lecky said:

"How other times, or scenes, or lands,
Had made us other men."

The American poet Bryant has described with touching pathos, an old man wandering to the rivulet on the banks of which he had played as a child:

"Years change thee not, but I am changed,
Since first thy pleasant banks I ranged:
And the grave stranger come to see
The play-place of his infancy,
Has scarce a single trace of him
Who sported once upon thy brim."

Notwithstanding the beautiful poetry written by Gerald Massey, a writer in the *Daily News*, June 6th, 1905, described how he found him quite cold to the subject of poetry, not having written any poetry for thirty years.

So that it is not the body merely that changes with time, but the mind, the intrinsic self-consciousness equally.

The substrative sense of identity continues so long as the capacity to generate thought is retained, but its character varies with every change of subjective relation. This suggests that identity is an inherited capacity of thought to assume relations to itself through the medium of an organism which it evolves in doing so.

If a person suffering from functional paralysis, be put into the hypnotic trance, and by suggestion be given the impression that he is at a period of his life before the paralysis developed, he will, so long as he is under the domination of that idea, be free from the paralysis.

So too, a porter in a state of intoxication, leaves a parcel at the wrong house. When sober, he has not the slightest recollection of the transaction, but the next time he is again intoxicated, it all comes back to his mind, and he goes and recovers the parcel.

"As here we find in trances, men
Forget the dream that happens then
Until they fall in trance again."

From the foregoing facts it is clear that thought is so dominated by the conditions of the organism which is its medium of expression, that it cannot stand in two dissimilar relations, or even in two degrees of the same relation to itself at the same instant. Shakespeare saw this when he made Macbeth exclaim:—

"Who can be wise, amazed, temperate, and furious,
Loyal and neutral in a moment?"

How it is possible to regard such absolutely and inextricably

interdependent conditions as those subsisting between thought and other forms of conscious, vital, chemical and organic change, as representing any relation than that of cause and effect, I am unable to imagine. There is obviously not the slightest movement or change in the one without involving its concomitant in essence and degree in the other.

But the fact that during this life, the relation existing between thought and physical change, is the supreme example of the operation of the law of cause and effect, does not appear in the least to militate against the possibility that thought can exist in its higher relations to itself, when disunited from those denser and more negative forms of itself which comprise the tangible and inert forms of terrestrial phenomena, as consciousness is clearly a relative term, ranging from the dim sensibility which causes the plant to grow towards the light, or from the bleak sea-breeze, to the most god-like apprehensions of genius.

Life.

Life, which seems from its infinite possibilities of manifestation, to include potentially all principles, every law of abstract relation, and therefore the mechanical, within itself, is, for that reason, the paradox of paradoxes, and therefore the truth of truths, the reality of realities.

We learn to perform certain actions by intelligent effort, and they, gradually, as we advance to the performance of more complicate processes, recede towards the sphere of the mechanical or automatic; and in proportion as an action is automatic its performance is unattended with pleasure.

The mechanical principle or quality appears to be at a maximum in predominantly physical temperaments, and at a minimum in intensely mental temperaments, but in reality mental manifestations seem to be a more transcendental phasis of the mechanical as they are of other principles.

Life seems to be a responsive relation existing between tangible and intangible forms of entity, by which they react the one upon the other.

If thought—as is generally held—is pure being, then concrete existence represents less sublimated forms of thought.

In living organisations the scale of idealisation from abstract thought to its most concrete counterparts seems graduated down from the brain, which appears to be the highest and most exquisite point in the circular catena of organs through which it is self-evolved, to the most sub-conscious circumferential organs as the cuticle, hair, and nails.

If properly constituted persons have the capacity to generate

mental function from the food elements they ingest, and by digestion and assimilation blend and metabolise them into such mental function, then such mental function is necessarily potential in such food elements, needing only ingestion by a properly organised mental and physical vitality, to convert and amalgamate them into mental function.

Could life be sensibly conceived of as an intrinsic entity apart from its functions, and the organic metamorphoses which accompany their correlative activities?

"Heaven lies about us in our infancy," says Wordsworth.

The further we advance into physical life, *i.e.*, sensational consciousness, the deeper, denser is the shadow cast on the mental—the soul-side of our natures.

Life, then, appears to be attributive reaction, under conditions which render it self-conscious, and thereby more or less capable of selecting its own conformation, and through that the direction of its evolution; such juxtaposition of phases or aspects of qualities as renders them self-reactive and self-readjustive, by reason of mutual antagonism or affinity of relation.

MAURICE L. JOHNSON.

PUBLIC OPINION IN ART.

It has long been held an axiom that the public is an ignorant and incompetent judge of art, that it has an obstinate, innate preference for bad work over good, and that only after being diligently schooled by the wiser few, can it be brought to recognise and support good art. Yet this has not been the case in all periods of artistic production. Among the Greeks the acclamation of the multitude was the goal, the standard, and the reward of artistic effort; and the Greek people have been rightly styled a nation of art critics. It was not so in the Renaissance. The people of Florence flocked in crowds to see Cimabue's Madonna, "and carried it triumphantly to the sound of trumpets and other festal demonstrations from his house to the church." It was not so in Elizabethan England; for the most supreme artist of all time was also the most popular dramatist of his age.

It was perhaps in the eighteenth century that this contumelious view of public opinion first became general. At that time literature had a narrower scope than at any former or later period, and tended to become a thing of technique and artifice. "Poetry and criticism," wrote Dryden, "are by no means the universal concern of the world, but are only the affair of idle men who write in their closets and of idle men who read in them"; and Pope satirizing the poets of the day, said:

> "So much they scorn the crowd that if the throng
> By chance go right, they purposely go wrong."

Thus the public is either treated as an incurable dunce and chastised accordingly, or as a promising child it is fed upon the milk of artistic knowledge, and primers on "How to listen to Music," or "How to know a good Book," are published for its improvement. Certainly there could be no more patient recipient of the splenetic humours of unsuccessful artists. The public is not a sentient organism, and feels no resentment under these slings and arrows of outraged genius. This view, moreover, reflects great credit on the critics, who are its chief mouth-pieces, for their noble efforts in the ungrateful task of moulding so unwieldy a throng as public opinion.

But do the critics really mould public opinion? It is not an

encouraging outlook for the modern artist if the power to appreciate and the power to reward are naturally severed; for this must inevitably tend to dissipate the energies of the artist in two directions. For many reasons, too, this view should appear something of a paradox. In the first place, we do not hesitate to put faith in the value of public opinion on the art and literature of the past. There is here no such feud between expert and amateur opinion. It is the verdict of the majority that makes a classic. Our knowledge of the productions of earlier generations is for the most part confined to a knowledge of those works which public opinion has pronounced immortal, and which public demand keeps in circulation. It is true that we have little choice in the matter. If antiquity has damned the best work to oblivion and left us only the second rate, we must put up with it. We cannot help ourselves. Still this is not the prevailing notion, for the verdict of posterity is tacitly admitted to be a standard as nearly infallible as any that is accessible to us. "Il faut songer," says Prosper Merimée, "que la posterité est une sorte d'etrangère, elle n'a pas la complaisance des contemporains, elle ne tolère pas les ennuyeux."

And if, for the sake of argument, the worthlessness of public opinion be admitted, what remains to us as a reliable standard of taste? Is the opinion of men of genius upon one another really the supreme and final criterion? The question has been answered once for all in that exquisite essay, *The Critic as Artist.*

> "So far from it being true," wrote Mr. Wilde, "that the artist is the best judge of art, a really great artist can never judge of other people's work at all, and can hardly, in fact, judge of his own. That very concentration of vision that makes a man an artist, limits by its sheer intensity his faculty of fine appreciation. The energy of creation hurries him blindly on to his own goal. The wheels of his chariot raise the dust as a cloud around him. The gods are hidden from each other. They can recognise their worshippers. That is all."

He then proceeds to point out that the realism of Euripides was hateful to Sophocles, that Wordsworth saw in *Endymion* merely a pretty piece of Paganism, and that Milton could not understand the method of Shakespeare any more than could Sir Joshua the method of Gainsborough.

Is it, then, the critics, equipped with an expert knowledge of the matter in hand, and unbiassed by the promptings of professional jealously, who hold the scales of art appreciation, and assess the true metal and the false? And by critics we mean not only the race of men abhorred by the late Mr. Whistler, but publishers, editors, hanging-committees, academies, actor-managers, and indeed all those whose noble avocation it is to appraise new works of creative art and mediate between the author and the public.

It is true that the art critic should have an advantage over the

ordinary man in the possession of a technical knowledge of his subject; but the truth is, the essential qualification of an art critic is not a knowledge of art, but a knowledge of art criticism. He is, moreover, an artist in his own line, and is more concerned with the requirements of his art than with helping the public to form an opinion on the subject under consideration.

And when we consider the facts it will be found there are really very few reputations that have been made by the expert minority. Critics have proved themselves only too diffident where the championship of rising talent was concerned. Nor have publishers been remarkable for persistency in bringing before the public works of unacknowledged merit.

On the other hand, how many cases are there where the work of rising genius has been detained in obscurity by the unwillingness of publishers to produce it, or by the failure of critics to recognise it. In how many cases has the critic appeared as an adversary rather than a herald of new genius, of an obstructor rather than a mediator. If, therefore, a man of genius has written a great book and no publisher will produce it, and critics are unanimous in disparaging it, are the public to be accused of tardiness and obtuseness in the recognition of new talent?

It must of course be borne in mind that the art public is not the public at large. Public opinion on art is, in the nature of the case, not the opinion of those who have no opinion on art at all. It is not the opinion of the masses, the self-styled labouring classes, who are the emancipated slaves of society; for art, like Alcibiades at the banquet, when preparing to speak on beauty, cries "Let the slaves and other profane and unmannered persons close up the door of their ears!" If it is still ambiguous who the art public are, let the reader look round among his friends for those who have a genuine love and appreciation of art, in one or all of its forms, though they neither write, paint nor compose, and he will have his finger on a small section of the public of the artist.

There is, it is true, one aspect of a work of art which cannot be pronounced upon except by the expert. There are certain effects in art, which are produced by a small expenditure of labour and skill; whilst there are others, possibly less striking, which may have called for an infinity of patience and skill in their attainment. This the expert will be aware of, and will praise accordingly, whereas the public will often be deluded, But the details are subordinate to the whole, the execution to the idea, and by however much or by however little skill an individual effect has been produced, it is still but a detail, and its ultimate value is just so much as it contributes to the perfection of the whole. Thus, in estimating the finished result, the expert has no advantage over the inexpert, the critic over the public.

The public cannot be expected to appreciate studies which are merely exercises in technique, or those which are more remarkable in technique than in idea. But the true æsthetic appreciation, which is an unreasoning impulse, not a logical process, an inward sensation, not a rational conviction, is a faculty which can be strengthened by use but not by knowledge.

The man who would purchase a treatise on "How to listen to Music," or "How to know a good Book," will never know a good book, nor will he ever listen appreciatively to music. The artistic sense is part of our temperament, and not of our intellectual stock-in-trade. It is a means to knowledge, but not a part of it, and belongs as much to the ordinary educated man as to the expert; and if there be a standard of merit in art in which we are justified in placing more faith than in any other, it is the opinion of the public.

JOHN RIVERS.

A NOTE UPON MARIE CORELLI.

BY ANOTHER WRITER OF LESS REPUTE.

MARIE CORELLI has many admirers. She is the ruler of a public that buys her books by the hundred thousand. She treats the Press with a hauteur the mere thought of which sends the less fortunate author into a tremor. She is, with the possible exception of Mr. Hall Caine, the greatest genius of self-advertisement produced by our century. That she should claim to have called forth the praises of Gladstone and Tennyson is of itself a title to consideration. For many years she has arrogated to herself the right to sit in judgment upon all classes, all institutions and all professions. She has had, and will continue to have, bitter detractors; and these critics are found in the ranks of thoughtful people; but she has procured a popularity in her life-time which is in its way unique, and her works are worthy of serious consideration on that account. There is a Corelli cult—a public that condones anything she says or does, to which she is an impeccable writer and an inspired teacher. When our late Queen ordered all her books to be sent to her this was held to be a crowning proof of Miss Corelli's skill; yet we cannot hold that the critical abilities of the people by whom *Barabbas* is held to have a demoralising effect upon its readers, are altogether wrong.

In Literature there is the supreme test of style by which all good books may be recognised, by virtue of which all writers are of the same race, even as all cultured people can find bonds of sympathy existing between them though they meet as strangers. Flaubert is brother to Pater, de Maupassant friend of Hardy. But in opposition to this relationship there is the great unformulated need that each writer shall found his own school, shall in the degree of his genius destroy the errors of his predecessors. When Mrs. Oliphant and Mrs. Henry Wood destroyed the tradition of Jane Austen and George Eliot they founded a school which has been fatal to every disciple since then. They became the mothers of the *Family Herald* and kindred periodicals. We have innumerable lady writers who might exchange title pages without the fraud being discovered by even their most enthusiastic admirers. Miss Broughton's style is not far removed from that of Miss Carey: nor are there many points of distinction between the books of Annie Swan and Adelaide Sargeant. Their work is of the kind which any educated person of

average intelligence might perform if only trouble enough were taken. Nothing was ever so easily copied, and copied with some degree of charm. There are writers of modern fiction who are almost as dexterous as the ladies mentioned, but whose work generally appears in the popular penny press or as *Daily Mail feuilleton.*

Books are very like individuals; you know almost at once whether they are meant to enter into your life, whether they are to rouse your emotions into activity, whether they are to soothe or madden you by their force of character. And after an hour's intimacy you can safely say whether your sensation will be one of relief or sorrow at parting.

Now the invocation of fiction must always chiefly be to the unthinking classes, for in no generation have there been enough critical people to make what is called a "great public." People are now beginning to read George Meredith, and some are even buying library editions of Henry James and Thomas Hardy; but it is because they have been told what to read by people whose opinions really matter, and whose judgments only wait for the confirmation of the years. But the popular writer of a generation, of a given number of years, is never chosen because of his genius. The masses are not logical enough or discriminating enough to choose the best, though they may not always reject the good. Sometimes they choose a writer of real merit, though generally it is an author with only moderate claims to attention, and a writer who deserves more reproof than praise.

Miss Corelli published her first novel before she had reached her twenties, and sprang at once into popularity. The Press gave her the discriminating reception which her claims merited. Her first book was jeered at by reviewers—and justly! for her second book was praised very honestly. But the young writer assumed the pose of an injured being whom malevolent critics had conspired to depreciate and to "rob of my readers." It is questionable whether any youthful author has received fairer treatment: and the recent success of Miss Marjorie Bowen might be cited as a proof of critical perspicacity. But Miss Correlli has carried her campaign of abuse from novel to novel, and is never weary of proclaiming her animosity. I have recently completed the perusal of *The Treasure of Heaven;* this is Miss Corelli's contribution to literature for the year 1906, and to the best of my knowledge the twelfth romance from her pen. Having followed Miss Corelli's career with great interest, I have found myself marvelling for many years at the egotism of the lady whose face here appears "for the second time only" before an admiring public. The questions which I have asked myself with marked insistence have been, "Who are chiefly Marie Corelli's admirers?" "Why is she so popular?" and "What relation does the popularity of an author bear to the quality of the writer's books?"

It is a mistake to suppose that originality is likely to succeed where honest merit only meets with moderate success. In fiction it is generally the most hackneyed of writers who receive a good reception, while true originality does but serve to disconcert the reader who has come to love familiar situations.

No writer is greater than the age in which he lives. Our grandfathers idolised Dickens and Thackeray. Time has shown them to have been right in their choice: we have Meredith and Hardy to-day, but they are not widely read. Corelli is the symbol of our superficial generation. Now the merit by which this lady had conquered the reading world is not the merit of orginality. She has given us no new revelation of beauty in life; she has only given us elaborations of an already threadbare tradition. Will the novels of Miss Corelli take a place with *Diana of the Crossways* or *Tess* among the classics of English fiction? Merely to ask the question is to provoke hearty laughter. For Miss Corelli writes at the top of her voice. Admirable as may be deemed many of her pen-pictures, there is in them, as in all her work, a sense of elaborateness which dries up admiration. This is a description of night: "around and above it the deep sky swept in a ring of sable blue, wherein thousands of stars were visible, encamped after the fashion of a mighty army, with sentinel planets taking their turns on duty in the watching of a rebellious world." When I was younger and sillier the colouring of Miss Corelli's canvases amazed and charmed me; now I can only wonder at the colour-blindness of those who have not emancipated themselves from her thraldom and learned to see that she uses a whitewash brush and the commonest of distempers. I think that I was born with the love of books in my blood: I have the same instinctive appreciation of the music of language which the musician has for a splendid score. But a page of prose from Miss Corelli's books, with its disjointed punctuation, its insistent emphasis, its unnecessary marks of exclamation, has always disturbed me, and now leaves me cold or annoys me by its turgid style.

What I reproach Miss Corelli with is that her grammar is so faulty. There is nothing you cannot find in her pages, from the most flowery periods of Lytton to the commonest of journalese. She seeks immortality in the heaping of epithet upon epithet, adjective upon adjective. She does not discriminate. The genuine artist remembers only what is necessary and forgets all that is useless. In her conversations she raves over humanity, and proclaims in a loud voice the immortality of the Creator, but it is evident that she thinks her own will be as durable. Her ambition is pithily—I use the word to mean briefly, not forcibly—expressed in this conversation between Angus Reay, a journalist, and Helmsley, the millionaire hero:

"'It's a book. A novel. And'—here he set his teeth hard—'I intend that it shall make me—famous!'

"'The intention is good,' said Helmsley, slowly, 'but—there are so many novels.'

"'No, there are not!' declared Reay, decisively. 'There are plenty of rag-books *called* novels, but they are not real "novels." There's nothing "new" in them! There's no touch of real, suffering, palpitating humanity in them! The humanity of to-day is infinitely more complex than it was in the days of Scott or Dickens, but there's no Scott or Dickens to epitomise its character or delineate its temperament. I want to be the twentieth-century Scott and Dickens rolled into one stupendous literary Titan!'

"His mellow laughter was hearty and robust. Helmsley caught its infection and laughed too."

Many of Miss Corelli's readers will catch the infection of Reay's "mellow laughter," though from a different motive.

Every function becomes organic in time and to the lady novelist who has written her dozen books there follows the bi-annual volume with increasing facility. The latest novel is but a hash-up of earlier ones. Even the most powerful, and therefore the most original of organisms, must see its nature becoming automatic in the course of time. The work of last year is produced this year almost mechanically. The admitted man of genius becomes tainted with mannerism, and cannot long retain the freshness of his style either in literature or painting or sculpture. The worthy old lady who read through the whole of Miss Corelli's novels and then said, "What a lot of practice she has had to be sure," was not far wrong in her criticisms of that lady's art. For the automatic functions of the highest centres of the brain come to us not in thoughts, but in emotions, and fiction lives upon emotions. The multitude of average people whose brains work automatically are wholly restricted to emotions, and a real thought is alien to their minds. They never see anything but half-obscured pictures. If you were to demand at any moment of these people what they were thinking, you would find that they were totally unable to describe their ideas, not from incapacity of language, but because their thoughts were only half-formed or wholly intangible. Emotion is what is inherited in our natures, but cogitation, sharp and precise, is action on the part of the individual, and entirely different from contemplation.

Miss Corelli is the most emotional writer among us to-day, and in that fact lies the secret of her appeal to the unthinking classes. She is sentimental, pathetic, mawkish, bitter, tender and sensuous by turn. The majority of the readers of her books are undoubtedly taken from the members of her own sex, in middle-class society, and from the working classes—shop-girls and young men of the large towns. She is doted on in the drawing-room as well as in the servants' hall. I have a shrewd suspicion that the features which provoke the keenest criticism of men who know how to discriminate, are the features which are the most popular with women and youths. She has the courage of her hysteria and is not afraid to scream.

Let us seek to realise the conditions of life which surround the great working classes. Each day must be passed under the most restricting of rules. Outside the family circle the average worker does not become acquainted with more than a dozen people. It is a good test of the accuracy of this statement to ask the average person to write down a list of names of the people with whom he is intimately acquainted. Generally the first halt occurs at the tenth name, sometimes at the fifth or sixth. They get little opportunity therefore of casting a glance into the minds of abnormal people, and unless they are of a specially sensitive nature they will not possess the faculty of projecting themselves into the personality of every person whom they meet. They have little knowledge, from personal experience, of the great passions and feelings of humanity, the bewilderments and distractions of those whose lives are shaped after a strange pattern, and who have to face a crisis at irregular periods of their lives. Were they compelled to form their judgments of the world from their own personal observation they would scarcely be convinced that Hamlet could have been the distraught genius that Shakespeare paints him, or that Juliet could love Romeo with such an intensity of desire that she would enter the tomb where he lay. Their own lives are commonplace. But they read Corelli—and here they find stupendous events in plenty—devils and angels, his Satanic Majesty himself, adventurers and criminals, poets and mystics. It is even possible to rub shoulders with the Divine Figure of the world's history, for He figures as a puppet among raving women and moonstruck men in *Barabbas.*

The writers of a book of biography, lying presently on my desk, which deals with Miss Corelli as Woman and Writer, are greatly concerned that the critics should have dealt so harshly with her productions. They suggest that these reviewers have not troubled to read the lady's works. But they are wrong—it is because her critics have read, and read with insight, that they have been induced to see the evil effect which hysteria can work upon the masses. Encouraged by a perusal of this Biography I recently spent a month upon Miss Corelli's productions, reading them in the order of publication; her *Romance of Two Worlds, Vendetta, Thelma,* &c. Some I had not looked at for ten years. It is difficult to criticise such work as this. It is really as admirably fitted to the disturbed appetites of modern men and women as the adulterated bread and the artificially-freshened meat which we eat. I do not for a moment believe that such literature is to be found in any other European country. In France and the United States there are several men and women whose works are entitled to the austere name of Art (the late Stephen Crane was one of them), but the rest of the fiction writers are so popular as to be ignored by the makers of thought. However, *Ardath* and *Thelma*—to take the best of

Miss Corelli's novels—are not bad art in the way that the novels of Georges Ohnet or Upton Sinclair are bad: they are excellent inasmuch as they achieve (let us say) their purpose and are rather cleverly construed. What surprises the critic of cultured taste is that work of this kind can be in its degree so good and yet remain so devoid of literary or artistic charm. Here is a short paragraph from *The Treasure of Heaven*:

"'Do you know'—and here he stopped in the middle of the rugged, winding street, and looked earnestly at his companion—'do you know what I see men doing at the present day? I see them rushing towards the verge—the very extreme edge of what they imagine to be the Actual—and from that edge getting ready to plunge—into Nothingness!'"

A lady who writes like this will no doubt find plenty of admirers who conceive writing of this kind to be "beautiful." That Miss Corelli is the most widely read novelist of to-day is the miraculous secret of our mediocrity, our stupidity, our lack of perception. According to all the laws of psychology, it is inevitable that the individual who cannot by his own observation correct an author's errors, or justify the assertions made in his pages, should take them as positive communications—should believe them without the slightest degree of distrust, and should make his or her judgments his preferences, the novelist's aversions his own. Like the subtle suggestion exerted by hypnotism, that exerted by Miss Corelli is insidious, and it is only the imperfectly developed individual who falls under her charm—those beings who are made after set patterns, who are tied to a routine—young women, domesticated matrons, youths, and those who are hysterical or weak in nerve and brain.

Theos Alwyn has produced a whole race of Alwyns, who are in private life only counter-jumpers, but who have all the high aspirations and the soul-throbbings of their model, and who boast sometimes that they can wing their way into space at will. Over the middle classes Miss Corelli holds the influence that Jacob held over the sheep. She has placed in her mental water-trough "rods of green poplar, and of the hazel and chestnut tree; and pilled white strakes in them, and made the white appear which was in the rods."

Like Jacob she has "set the rods which were pilled before the flocks in the gutters in the watering-troughs when the flocks came to drink, that they should conceive when they came to drink."

"And the flocks conceived before the rods, and brought forth cattle ringstraked, speckled, and spotted." The public have conceived Miss Corelli's genius from the suggestions made by her own great vanity. Admirers of the *Sorrows of Satan* inform me that Miss Corelli is an artist in this psychological study of the Devil. But that is not possible. The artist shows what he is going to make of his material the moment he commences to work: he but improves upon his first attempts. No doubt that is an inevitable

result of practice whether in paint or ink, but I have found the style of the Romance so very chaotic and clumsy that I cannot believe Miss Corelli will ever turn out a book worthy of a position of importance in the literature of our times.

It may safely be questioned whether any evils to our social state have surpassed the irrational and obscure exploitation of new "creeds." Between the cold science of Huxley, Spencer and Darwin, and the sublime ravings of Corelli there is the widest of gulfs, but even positivism is preferable to absurdity. Let us examine Miss Corelli's erudition in some slight degree. Errors in punctuation and grammar are dominant, and it might be deemed pedantic to point them out; but there are more serious blunders. At the close of the garden-party given by Rimânes (*Sorrows of Satan*) his Satanic Majesty causes a transparency to be exhibited before his departing guests bearing the word "Vale." Evidently Miss Corelli did not know the meaning of the word, its absurdity in such a connection is obvious. There is no Roman name Galbus (*Barabbas*), Volpian is not antique, and is rather modern Italian than Roman. The vocative case of Peter could never be Petrus, and Pilate's wife would never have addressed him as Pontius. Her own name, Justitia, is impossible, for it is an abstract noun. Judith Iscariot is a misnomer, and Miss Corelli is touchingly simple in believing that the Hebrews had family names like Brown or Robinson, and that Iscariot was one of them. There were no chairs in Arabia (*Ardath*), yet we find Heliobas showing several of "very ancient design." We are quaintly informed that bells rang out morning and evening in Jerusalem before churches had learned the use of chimes. We are told of "the veritable signature of Homer," and of "twelve moderately thick sheets of ivory" on which was written the vision of Esdras, engraved "by some sharp and evidently well-pointed instrument" in a language "only kept up among scholars and sages." There were shop-fronts in Ninevah also, a flight of imagination which belongs to Miss Corelli alone. We read of Nirjâlis (that accent is a very important addition to the name, as important as the grave accent upon Azùl and Oruzèl) as "a pictured Dionysius." Did Miss Corelli mean Dionysus, and is her classical knowledge a trifle rusty? Perhaps this criticism would "dumbfounder" her, to quote a word which is decidedly impressive in her mouth. She speaks of Shelley as the "inspired starveling." We know that he was fond of raisins and white bread, but that was a matter of taste. Perhaps Chatterton was the name flitting through the lady's mind? Heliobas permits an acolyte to chant the opening words of the Credo at Mass: the choir recite the Angelus alternately with the organ, and prayers are directed to the Rosy Cross rather than to the Sacrament. Roman Catholicism, we are informed, was devised by St. Peter, a form of Apostolic

Succession which would embarrass the Vatican and unnerve all the controversialists. Pilate is made to wash his hands before the multitude. The Roman ritual must be entirely unknown to Miss Corelli, or she would have recognised that "rinsing them over and over again in the cold clear element, which sparkled in its polished receptacle" meant, not that he was innocent of Jesus' blood, but that he was bathing in it. In her bold romancing she cares as little for the accuracy of her descriptions as she does for the truth of her assertions. Where is the Biblical authority for Judith Iscariot, or the foolish self-abnegation of the Prince of Darkness, avowed enemy of mankind? The Acts of the Apostles gives the lie direct to her account of the death of Judas. The whole plot of both *Barabbas* and the *Sorrows of Satan* fall to the ground in the light of our Scriptures, and only the most infatuated of reviewers could have called the first-named book "a fifth gospel." In *Ardath* we read of Greek vestals in white. Were there vestals in Greece? I have always associated them with Rome.

The fact is that Miss Corelli has meditated little and thought less. The lady pretends to despise the critics, but is always retorting upon them. When in her stories conversation drags—and it is always conventional and stage-struck—the heroine falls back upon books. The good people are always virtuous to insipidity; the bad ones less wicked than their poses. Not one figure stands out as a character study. In a sensuous description of the Christ which is almost blasphemous, we read of his Herculean shoulders and his Apollo-like face. Satan is described in almost the same words. Geoffrey Tempest might well be Barabbas or Aubrey Leigh. Heliobas has been plagiarised by Miss Corelli from the works of the French decadent, M. Joséphin Péladan. The Rosy Cross, the Electric Creed, are all stolen from a degenerate writer of Paris. In the wide range of the twelve volumes which are in our libraries with this lady's name attached to their covers, there is not one sentence which will stand the test of honest analysis. If *The Sorrows of Satan* still continue to draw the reading world we must make allowance for the subject and its theatrical presentation. If *Barabbas* is read with appreciation it is because Christianity itself has received many shocks to its consistency by the hysterical degeneration of latter-day fanatics.[1] We can safely leave these books to Time. Fifty years from now Marie Corelli will be of the

1 Every lover of good literature must be in rebellion against the mystical degeneration commenced by Miss Corelli in the 'eighties, and carried to its most incoherent issue by a flock of writers who glory in their resemblance to that writer. Against the psychological analysis of true visionaries there can be no reasonable revolt, for it is the outward sign of an innate love of the spiritual and the beautiful. Seekers after an unsullied style, living in a world to which Art and only Art can find an entrance, are very valuable assets to the language in which they choose to write. But Marie Corelli cannot be numbered among these. True mysticism is Maeterlink; shoddy pseudo-spiritualism is Corelli.

company which includes the once-famous Mrs. Radcliffe, J. P. Smith, and Martin Tupper, the idols of the early Victorian era.

What is one to say to definitions like the following, culled from the last of Miss Corelli's colossal productions?

RESTAURANTS: "These gilded and refined eating-houses were now beginning to shoot forth their bundles of well-dressed, well-fed folk into the many and various conveyances waiting to receive them."

A MATRON: "Attired in an over-frilled and over-flounced costume of pale grey, which delicate Quakerish colour rather painfully intensified the mottled purplish-red of her face."

A WOMAN OF FASHION: "With black eyes and a viperish mouth, who commanded a certain exclusive "set" by virtue of being the wife of a dissolute earl, whose house was used as a common gambling resort."

A GIRL: "I don't believe in love . . . love isn't happiness. . . . It would be perfectly idiotic to refuse such a rich man, even if he were Methusaleh himself."

A LORD: "The dissipated, effeminate-looking young man . . . a modern degenerate of the worst type . . . abandoned rascal."

A CLERGYMAN: "He looked more like a petty officer of dragoons than a minister of the Christian religion—one of those exacting, small military martinets accustomed to brow-beating every subordinate without reason or justice."

A SOLICITOR: "Nobody minds what becomes of your soul or your body—the only question of importance to any one is what is to be done with your money."

NEWSPAPERS: "The donkey-journalism of the period, which brays down everything that is not like itself, mere froth and scum."

I repeat that Miss Corelli's influence is a baneful one. We must not ignore the influence of popular books upon the masses. It is from the production of that section of literary workers which devotes itself to the delineations of emotion that the crowd derives its ideals of morality and its conceptions of beauty. Miss Corelli is chief of this school. Should these demonstrations be absurd they exert a most disturbing and corrupting influence upon the views of a whole generation. Mr. Chesterton's *Defence of the Penny Dreadfuls* is not all paradox. When a magistrate asks his youthful prisoner in what course of reading he has been indulging, he flatters himself that he is profound. He is thinking of cheap weekly (and weakly) stories of adventure; his pre-conceived ideas would receive a shock if he were to receive the enthusiastic answer "Marie Corelli, your worship." It is not the literature of the gutter, the "Deadwood Dick" and "Buffalo Bill" class, which is at fault. That is generally as harmless as it is faulty in style and construction. It is the popular modern literature of the libraries which is responsible for loose morality, irresponsible action. These books have their vogue because they are masked under the guise of smartness; the authors should be made to understand the word in its true dictionary sense. I noticed not long ago in one of the popular magazines a symposium in which actresses, women of the

world, and others were asked to quote their favourite character in fiction. At the head of the list, an easy winner, loomed Mr. Hornung's "Raffles"—burglar, cricketer and courtier; but in his cleverness and ingenuity unmistakably a thief. This is to me a suggestive fact, for (although I do not care to mention names) the ladies who took part in this symposium are generally accredited to be people of at least average intelligence. Our hypocrisy in this department of thought is appalling. Sin is condoned if only it be sentimental, vice overlooked if it be only mawkish. I heard last year with indignation that a local library had removed Mr. Hardy's *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* from its shelves on the plea that "its effect upon the morals of the young is likely to be injurious." I wrote for the catalogue of this branch, saw a friend of the district upon the subject, and came away chuckling to myself because I had discovered that five copies each of *The Sorrows of Satan, Ziska* and *A Romance of Two Worlds* were in constant request, especially by impressionable young people. Oh, the blindness, the stupidity of our municipalities. . . . !

The school of which Miss Correlli is the emblem is a national evil, a peril to the social state. I have reason to be bitter in my denunciations; this lady's works were once a great deal to me; they helped to derange my adolescence; they stink in my nostrils now. That is human nature of course; we destroy our old gods, burn our ancient idols. Those we have most deeply loved we are most indifferent to when satiety has crept between us. But Marie Corelli is a false god. What would not every thinking man—and he is still a thinker whether he be considered a social saint or counted as a sinner—give for writers with the healthy vigour of Dickens and Thackeray, for the inoffensiveness of Wilkie Collins' mysteries, for the eagerness of the social battles waged by Reade and Kingsley! Our grandfathers knew good literature when they met it; true they worshipped Tupper and Thomas Moore, and poured streams of gold into the coffers of their publishers; but they would not have been deceived by twaddle like *Ziska*, or have gone into raptures over a writer of Miss Corelli's calibre. The degeneration of the last twenty years gave her a public to her hand.

What Miss Corelli has lacked has been proportion, without which there can be no literature. One is not honest by wishing to be so, any more than one is wise or prudent. The frenzied diatribes against vice in which this writer indulges are more pernicious than the vices themselves. What young people—either girl or impressionable youth—could read *The Sorrows of Satan*, or *Ziska*, and come through the ordeal as pure as they were before they handled the book? There are scenes in these novels which should never have been written. I quote a few paragraphs from the interview

between Lady Sybil and Tempest upon the occasion of their engagement,

"'I ask you, do you think a girl can read the books that are now freely published, and that her silly society friends tell her to read—"because it is so dreadfully *queer*!"—and yet remain unspoilt and innocent? Books that go into the details of the lives of outcasts?—that explain and analyse the secret vices of men?—that advocate almost as a sacred duty "free love" and universal polygamy?—that see no shame in introducing into the circles of good wives and pure-minded girls, a heroine who boldly seeks out a man, *any* man, in order that she may have a child by him, without the "degradation" of marrying him? I have read all those books, and what can you expect of me? Not innocence, surely. I despise men—I despise my own sex—I loathe myself for being a woman! You wonder at my fanaticism for Mavis Clare—it is only because for a time her books give me back my self-respect, and make me see humanity in a nobler light—because she restores to me, if only for an hour, a kind of glimmering belief in God, so that my mind feels refreshed and cleansed. All the same, you must not look upon me as an innocent young girl, Geoffrey, a girl such as the great poets idealised and sang of—I am a contaminated creature, trained to perfection in the lax morals and prurient literature of my day.'"

Then take this sensuous scene from a later chapter. Sybil Elton is offering her love to Rimânez; she is kneeling abjectly at his feet, and says:

"'With every pulse of my being I worship you!' she murmured passionately. 'My king! my god! the cruel things you say but deepen my love for you; you can kill, but you can never change me! For one kiss of your lips I would die—for one embrace from you I would give my soul! . . .'

"'Have you one to give?' he asked derisively. 'Is it not already disposed of? You should make sure of that first! Stay where you are and let me look at you! So!—a woman wearing a husband's name, holding a husband's honour, clothed in the very garments purchased with a husband's money, and newly risen from a husband's side, steals forth thus in the night, seeking to disgrace him and pollute herself with the vulgarest unchastity! And this is all that the culture and training of the nineteenth-century civilisation can do for you! Myself, I prefer the barbaric fashion of old times, when rough savages fought for their women as they fought for their cattle, treated them as cattle, and kept them in their place, never dreaming of endowing them with such strong virtues as truth and honour! If women were pure and true, then the lost happiness of the world might return to it, but the majority of them are like you—liars—ever pretending to be what they are not. I may do what I choose with you, you say? torture you, kill you, brand you with the name of outcast in the public sight, and curse you before heaven, if I will only love you!—all this is melodramatic speech, and I never cared for melodrama at any time. I shall neither kill you, brand you, curse you, nor love you! I shall simply—call your husband!'"

Is insidious stuff of this kind to be praised and read by the crowds? Yet these brief extracts illustrate a characteristic tendency of Miss Corelli's style to sensuousness and vivid colouring. She is

an erotic degenerate of the subtlest type. Had she been domesticated she might have been as harmless as her foreign contemporaries. As it is she stands alone, and the woman who has lost her womanliness is diseased. We may have in her case the body, the methods and the talents of a woman, but there are unmistakably demonstated also the arrogances and the intense prejudices of a man. Despite her photograph, and the sentimental interviews that she has caused to be published concerning her home-life, the only term which can be honestly applied to Marie Corelli is a "man-woman." So soon as a woman begins to concern herself passionately and discontentedly with problems which are not within the normal sphere of experience she loses the most charming asset of her sex. It is only on degenerate subjects that hysterical people can make effect. A strong healthy man looks for a woman who is above all things else womanly and kind. Miss Corelli's celibacy is a fact of wonderful psychological value.

It is absolutely essential that the reading world, especially the impressionable natures of young people, should be warned of the dangers which lurk like some subtle poison within the pages of insidious novels. Thinking minds should be constantly at work in teaching the difference between genuine feeling and simulated emotion. I speak as one with some knowledge of literature, and I know only too well the limitations which confine the average critic. He has not the time to discriminate: and praise is thrown lightly from hand to hand. He is almost compelled to write from the standpoint of the publishers and that majority which has wrong on its side. True, we have a few conscientious reviewers among us, who are above this kind of barter in cast-off literary clothing—"a story-teller of genius": "fascinating romance": "passion vibrates in every line": "throbbing feeling": "warm insight into the complexity of the soul"—oh, how the giant Thackeray would have laughed at this snobbery! The average critic makes a speciality of these high-sounding phrases: the self-respecting author should blush when he reads them: an intelligent being would be afraid that he was serving as the butt of a practical joke.

But the danger to the public lies in the generally depraved taste which prevails, the result of twenty or thirty years of this cloying sentimentalism. It lies in the carelessness of Libraries' Committees, in the greed for gold which is the feature of our age, and which has nearly all writers under its control. I find my plea for this outspoken writing in the conviction that when a man holds strong opinions upon any subject he has no right to withhold them, in fact he could not if he so desired: well-formed conceptions, mental or material, must inevitably force their way into the light of day. The suggestive power of literature is incalculable. A writer of the calibre which I have tried to pourtray trains up a nation of criminals

and weaklings; a Hugo, a Balzac, a Dickens, a Thackeray, a Goethe, one of self-respecting and earnest beings, altruists to the tips of their fingers. It is the artist, whether he paint in oils of words or have stone as his material, who is responsible for the state of his country —though conversely he is less responsible for his own errors in judgment, being in his turn the product of artists who have preceded him—and the true student of psychology should seek answers to the questions, "What do you read, eat, drink, and admire? Where do you live, and are you healthy?" The phenomena of action would then be no longer a mystery.

Let me repeat, in conclusion, that I do not bring any superficial knowledge to bear upon the subject of Miss Corelli's works. I have read them all—some two or three times: as a youth with some show of enthusiasm, as a man with shuddering and distaste. I have not here regarded the opinions of the majority, but have devoted myself to a calm consideration of her position. I declare emphatically that Miss Marie Corelli is a social menace. I believe that with all my soul, and I would rejoice to see her books banned by the libraries as insidious and harmful to public morality.

Peril.

DAUGHTERS OF TOIL.

"Honest Labour wears a lovely face.'

DAUGHTERS of toil revere yourselves
And honour your vocations,
So shall the beauty of your lives
Add lustre to the nations;
For purer manners, higher aims
And better homes must grow
Where the worth of work is recognised,
And the emptiness of show.

No longer stoop to fashion's arts
To gain what all may own,
The title of a gentle woman,
The womanliest title known.
Be truthful, gracious, generous, brave,
Your purpose to fulfil,
And the humblest field of labour
You need not blush to till.

Such women as Florence Nightingale
And Margaret Fuller leave
The landmarks of true dignity
To which we all should cleave;
In times gone by luxurious ease
Its victories hath won,
Now a brighter day has dawned—
For labour is the sun!

O may its beams enlighten
The darken'd paths of life,
And show that human happiness
Lies not in endless strife
For larger means, or higher rank,
Or what is called success,
But in resolute helpful efforts
Mankind to aid and bless.

JANE ANN HEAVISIDES SIMPSON.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

SCIENCE.

It is a great assistance to the reader of a book when the author summarises his views at the commencement. This has been done by the author of *The Nature and Purpose of the Universe*[1] in the form of twenty-four theses, which are subsequently explained, and expanded at considerable length. The of the book is somewhat misleading, for the author does not deal with the world as known to modern science; but rather treats of human life in the present and more especially in the hereafter. Mr. Parsons considers that all the spheres in space are connected by planes, and says: "It cannot be proven by us incarnate humans that the so-called dead do not survive in some such world or plane; and there is adequate ground for assuming that they do so survive. . . . ." As may be imagined, the evidence adduced will not stand the strain of scientific tests, being mainly a matter of belief; but it must be acknowledged that the author displays considerable erudition, and has consulted a very large number of works bearing upon his subject. His criticisms of the Gospels and the Acts are fair and well-founded, and may be read with advantage by all those who look upon the New Testament as a work of Divine inspiration. Although Mr. Parsons has not converted us to his views, yet we have spent some pleasant hours over his book, and have read with interest the many fragments of ancient lore with which it abounds.

During the last quarter of a century two subjects have forced themselves upon the attention of thinking men and women, namely, race suicide and the great increase in numbers of the insane. No doubt both questions have always existed; but the statistics which are now available enable us to form a sounder opinion, while at the same time they give rise to the apprehension that most civilised races are undergoing a process of deterioration. The increased interest shown in these matters is to a large extent due to the heavy expenditure which the upkeep of degenerates necessitates under our present system of *laissez faire*. No less than £13,000,000 is spent annually for this purpose, according to

[1] *The Nature and Purpose of the Universe.* By J. D. Parsons. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1906.

the official returns, and each year shows a considerable increase, far beyond that which might be expected from the increase in population. Many theories have been propounded to explain this grave fact; but few have ventured to propose a remedy. Now, however, Dr. R. R. Rentoul publishes in complete form[1] the proposals which he has been making for several years; but which have not met with that attention from the Press which their importance merits. We do not like to face disagreeable problems, and, in Great Britain at least, race and sexual questions are kept in the background to such an extent that most persons of average education are entirely ignorant of them. Dr. Rentoul's book is practically a second and enlarged edition of an essay published three years ago, in which a method of treating certain mental and physical degenerates was advocated. The author was struck by the fact that under our present system mental degenerates are encouraged to produce offspring that are in their turn degenerate and are also carefully nurtured and protected at the cost of the sane and laborious members of the community. It has been suggested that medical certificates of freedom from hereditary taint should be made a necessary condition of marriage; but it is clear that this would only increase the number of illegitimate births, and although a high caste might thus be created it would be at the expense of those who might not be able to procure such a certificate. Dr. Rentoul's remedy is an absolute one; he proposes that all those who would undoubtedly produce degenerate offspring, if allowed to do so should be subjected to a simple and safe operation, which would prevent them from bringing into the world beings even more unhappy and degenerate than themselves. There can be little doubt that if such a method were adopted we could in one or two generations free ourselves from the ever-increasing taint of insanity and other hereditary diseases; but it would be necessary also to shut the door to the scum of other nations which now threatens to overwhelm us. For full details of the proposals we must refer those interested in the subject to Dr. Rentoul's book, and we trust the matter will meet with the public attention which it deserves. It is significant of the public attitude towards this important matter that eleven publishers refused to publish the book, and we must congratulate the Walter Scott Publishing Co., Ltd., on having had the courage to undertake the task.

1 *Race Culture; or, Race Suicide?* By R. R. Rentoul, M.D. London: The Walter Scott Publishing Co., Ltd. 1906.

PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.

A new volume by Dr. J. G. Frazer will be received with the warmest interest by every one who is acquainted with *The Golden Bough*, one of the most important works of the Anthropological School. The volume recently issued, *Adonis Attis Osiris*,[1] is not only on the same lines as the earlier work, but the material it contains is intended to form part of the third edition of *The Golden Bough* which Dr. Frazer has in preparation. Though some of the theories with regard to Oriental religions which are associated with the name of Dr. Frazer reappear in this volume, the chief interest lies in the principal object of the work, which is to connect the myths of Adonis, Attis and Osiris with the phenomena of vegetation; whether, as it was at one time held, all myths are nature-myths is true or not, Dr. Frazer makes it clear to our satisfaction that the myths under consideration certainly were. The various rites associated with these myths cannot be satisfactorily explained on any other hypothesis. Some authorities hold that the death and resurrection of Osiris represent the setting and the rising sun, but we hold Dr. Frazer's theory to be the more probable one by far. It is true, as he says: "The spectacle of the great changes which annually pass over the face of the earth has powerfully impressed the minds of men in all ages, and stirred them to meditate on the causes of transformations so vast and so wonderful." And this yearly transformation must have seemed not only impressive but mysterious to untaught men. It is not to be wondered at if they imagined that the life of vegetation depended upon a source of life beyond which they identified as a god and named accordingly, and the decline and revival of life on earth they believed to be the consequence of the actual death or decline and revival or resurrection of the god himself. In early times they not only lamented the one and rejoiced over the other, but, as Dr. Frazer points out, instituted magical rites to reinforce the reviving strength or to hasten the resuscitation of the deity. "Under the names of Osiris, Tammuz, Adonis and Attis, the peoples of Egypt and Western Asia represented the yearly decay and revival of life, especially of vegetable life, which they personified as a god who actually died and rose from the dead. In name and detail the rites varied from place to place; in substance they were the same. The supposed death and resurrection of this Oriental deity, a god of many names but of essentially one nature, is the subject of the present inquiry." With what abundance of learning, with what wealth of illustration

[1] *Adonis Attis Osiris.* Studies in the History of Oriental Religion. By J. G Frazer, D.C.L., LL.D., Litt.D. London and New York: Macmillan.

and charm of style this inquiry is carried on, readers of Dr. Frazer's previous works need scarcely be told; though in the matter of style and picturesque treatment this is really an advance, which is in some measure due to the fact that the author has paid, as he confesses, more attention than formerly to the natural features of the countries in which the myths arose and the rites were practised. There is one point which we are disposed to be a little sceptical about, which is not necessary to the main thesis, and that is Dr. Frazer's doctrine of the ancient custom of the burning of a king or a member of a royal family. It seems to us possible that Dr. Frazer may have taken what may be merely an incident in a mystery-play or a legend arising from the distortion of some natural accident or calamity as an actual and purposeful voluntary act. This comes out in the legend of the voluntary sacrifice of Sardanapalus on a funeral pyre. The true story, as Dr. Frazer himself tells us, from which the legend sprang, is very different—the victim was not Sardanapalus but his brother Shamashshumukin, who preferred to die in a palace in flames rather than to fall into the hands of his offended brother. The legend that Crœsus was burned by Cyrus, has still less foundation, as he was not burned and the act as far as it went was not voluntary. So the legend lends no support to Dr. Frazer's theory. Nor is anything gained by referring to "Semiramis herself, the legendary queen of Syria, who is said to have burnt herself on a pyre out of grief at the death of a favourite horse." Even if it were history and not legend the motive would take it out of the category of representative sacrifices. Dr. Frazer admits the weakness of the evidence in the case of Adonis for his theory. On page 125, where his conclusion is stated, we find that certain traditions and monuments seem to preserve traces of the practice, that the custom was *apparently* mitigated, the evidence is *ambiguous, fragmentary, uncertain,* "and the conclusions built upon it inevitably partake of the weakness of the foundation." Surely no conclusions ought to be built upon evidence of such a character. Whether Dr. Frazer is right or not on this particular point, there can be no question about the masterly character of the book, which is so full of interest and written in so fascinating a style that whether a reader is of the author's school or not he will find in the reading of it an unusual source of pleasure.

A small and mildly interesting volume, *Great Moral Teachers*,[1] consists of a series of lectures delivered by Edward Russell Bernard, in his capacity as Chancellor of the Cathedral of Salisbury. Under the circumstances the lectures are perhaps as good as we can expect. One could scarcely expect that a chancellor of a cathedral, in fulfilment of a statutory obligation, would have anything illuminating to

1 *Great Moral Teachers.* Eight Lectures delivered at Salisbury Cathedral. By Edward Russell Bernard, M.A. London and New York: Macmillan. 1906.

say of Confucius, Gotama, Socrates, and Epictetus. The point of view is that which arises from a comparison of the teaching of these great moralists with that of Jesus Christ. Epictetus receives the greatest amount of attention, five out of the eight lectures being devoted to him. Mr. Russell has some appreciation of his subject, but to do it full justice he needs more detachment than is displayed in this volume.

Interest in *The Apocalypse of St. John*,[1] commonly called the *Book of Revelation*, has greatly declined in recent years, less interest is taken in prophetic literature since the influences of historical study have upset so many visionary religious beliefs, and realities have taken the place formerly occupied by dreams. Nevertheless the Apocalypse has exercised so important an influence on Christian doctrine and thinking that its study ought not to be neglected by competent theologians, though perhaps the less untrained minds have to do with it the better. Dr. Swete's edition of the Greek text with introduction and notes should therefore be, and no doubt will be, heartily welcomed by New Testament scholars, to whom we cordially recommend it. As this is not a theological journal, we may be excused for not entering into controversial questions relating to the authorship and date of this remarkable work. Dr. Swete differs from Westcott, Lightfoot, and Hort in adhering to the view that the book was composed in the last years of Domitian, and not earlier. As to the authorship, Dr. Swete keeps an open mind, but inclines to the traditional view which ascribes the Apocalypse to the Apostle of that name. The introduction contains a mass of valuable information on matters more or less closely related to the book and its historical setting which is indispensable for an intelligent study, and the reader is assisted by maps of Asia Minor in the time of Domitian, a plate representing coins of Apocalyptical cities, a view of Patmos, &c. The Greek text is clearly and admirably printed, and the notes are exhaustive. It is a fine book altogether.

There are a large number of people who respect orthodox Christianity, but who cannot satisfy themselves with rationalism or agnosticism and have a desire for a reasonable expression of religion; to such we can fairly recommend *Christianity and Tradition*,[2] by Mr. P. G. Blyth. The book covers a very large field, and deals intelligently and freely with subjects usually associated with religion, such as authority and individualism, the nature of belief, Jesus and his authority, Christian conduct and religious observances, and the burning question of religious education. The book is not written either from what is called the critical or the anthropological point of view, but from the practical one, and is eminently reasonable.

[1] *The Apocalypse of St. John.* The Greek Text, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices. By Henry Barclay Swete, D.D. London and New York: Macmillan.

[2] *Christianity and Tradition.* By P. G. Blyth, M.A. London: Watts & Co. 1906.

The author is "almost a Christian," or perhaps he might claim to be a better one than many who go by the name.

Mr. F. J. Gould is indefatigable in his endeavours to promote rational education and to assist school teachers; his latest effort in this direction is an admirable one.[1] It is a selection of stories from Plutarch's *Lives*, written, with explanations, for the use of children, or, as we should be inclined to say, for the use of teachers, who must often feel the lack of books of the kind. Six illustrations by Mr. Walter Crane enhance the attractiveness of the book, which would make an excellent present for a boy or girl.

A book, also suitable for a present or for a Bible-class, is *The Romance of Precious Bibles*,[2] by Rev. Sidney N. Sedgwick. This consists of eight stories of adventure more or less historical, in which some famous copy of the Bible, MS. or printed, is concerned. The stories are prettily told and interesting in themselves, besides conveying useful information on out-of-the-way subjects. We can recommend this book either for schools or families.

Mr. Charles Witchell has won a deservedly high reputation as a naturalist by his books on birds, and a combination of his knowledge as a naturalist with his social sympathies has, no doubt, led to the production of this work on *The Cultivation of Man*.[3] Mr. Witchell refers briefly to the forces which in the past have led to the improvement of the race, and though these have apparently worked at haphazard, the law of the survival of the fittest has infinitely improved the type in some respects, but Mr. Witchell pleads for the introduction of a more scientific method, analogous to artificial selection, by the regulation of marriage, or, as he epigrammatically expresses it, the "selection of parents." The first effect of this would be of a physical character, but it would inevitably be attended by intellectual and moral advance. Mr. Witchell's ideal is a high one, and extends far beyond mere material improvement, both individually and socially. Mr. Witchell feels very strongly, as we all ought to do, the misery of present social conditions. Mr. Witchell is a combination of the rationalist and poet, an apostle and a scientist in one. He yearns to see man choosing a better road to happiness which may lead to more success than he has hitherto found. We wish him success in his praiseworthy mission.

[1] *The Children's Plutarch.* (*Plutarch's Lives* told in Simple Language.) By F. J. Gould. London: Watts & Co. 1906.

[2] *The Romance of Precious Bibles.* By the Rev. Sidney N. Sedgwick. London: Samuel Bagster & Sons. 1906.

[3] *The Cultivation of Man, according to the Teachings of Common Sense.* By Charles A. Witchell. London: Watts & Co.

SOCIOLOGY, POLITICS, AND JURISPRUDENCE.

To the present generation the name of the late Dr. Thomas W. Evans, the surgeon-dentist to Napoleon III. and his Court, is probably quite unknown, and yet, owing to his services to the wounded and imprisoned French soldiers during the Franco-German war, his name was a household one throughout Europe and the United States. His *Memoirs: Recollections of the Second French Empire*,[1] have been edited by his colleague in the ambulance work, Dr. Edward A. Crane, or rather they have been rewritten, since, as his editor remarks, Dr. Evans had little pretensions to literary ability. Wherever possible, however, Dr. Evans has been left to tell his story in his own language; and although this involves a good deal of repetition and diffuseness, yet it is not to be regretted. As Dr. Crane truly says, "Dr. Evans's long and close attachment to Napoleon III. and his family, the confidential relations he maintained with other sovereigns and princely houses and his large and intimate acquaintance among the men and women who, from 1848 to 1870, were the governing powers in Europe, afforded him unusual opportunities of observing the evolution of political ideas and institutions in France, and the conditions and causes that immediately preceded and determined the fall of the Second French Empire, as seen from within, and supplied him also with facts and very valuable information concerning the same subjects as seen, or gathered in, from without. No man, moreover, was better acquainted than he with what may be termed the moral atmosphere of the several Courts to which for so many years he was professionally attached." A citizen of the United States, and a democrat, yet Dr. Evans was heart and soul an imperialist. Attached by ties of the most intimate nature to the Imperial family, he devoted himself to its fortunes and, when these collapsed, became its champion and advocate. In weighing his vindication, therefore, of Napoleon's character and that of his consort, allowance must be made for this natural bias. The Emperor was doubtless deceived by his military advisers as to the condition of the army, and he may have been pushed into the war, as Dr. Evans says, by the nation, or rather the noisy section—the Parisian mob—but a more careful administrator must, if he had taken the trouble, have ascertained the state of the army, and a stronger ruler who thought less of his dynasty would have resisted mob-pressure. At the same time it is clear that if the people had remained loyal to the Crown after the catastrophe of Sedan, France would have obtained far better terms and would have preserved the

[1] *The Memoirs of Dr. Thomas W. Evans.* Recollections of the Second French Empire. Edited by Edward A. Crane, M.D. Illustrated. Two vols. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

integrity of her territory. The Republican Government, Favre, Thiers and the traitor General Trochu—for traitor he undoubtedly was—simply played into the hands of the astute and unscrupulous Bismarck. Dr. Evans's vindication of the Empress is perhaps more convincing. Up to the war she had taken no part in foreign affairs; but when, as Regent, the whole responsibility of the peace negotiations was thrown upon her, she responded nobly. Had she agreed to Bismarck's terms she might have gained the Crown for the Prince Imperial. Dr. Evans was quite right when he wrote of her, "You have happily lived to see that your heroism, your self-sacrifice, your sorrows, have secured to you the admiration and the sympathy of the world—the world that will soon forget your enemies and all their works, and remember you for centuries as one of the most beautiful and sympathetic figures that have sat upon a throne, as one whose story is the sum of all the romance and tragedy of a woman's life." The story of the Empress's flight from Paris, under the conduct of Dr. Evans, is here told in detail for the first time. For ourselves, we have read these two volumes from cover to cover with absorbing interest.

In her brilliant and scholarly survey of *The Family*[1] Mrs. Helen Bosanquet disarms criticism by observing that it has been impossible for her with very limited resources of knowledge and experience to do more than suggest in its modest outlines what the history of the family has been in the past. It is, she remarks, a great work waiting for a great scholar. The present volume has just missed being a great work because Mrs. Bosanquet has neglected the true methods of scientific treatment. This is the more to be regretted since in this country little has been written on the subject, and the well-known treatises of French and German writers are largely inaccessible to English students. In her desire to counteract certain collectivist tendencies—State and municipal interference and control—she has allowed her bias to warp her judgment. She has in our opinion misrepresented the ideal family as the normal. Of this ideal family she has much to tell us of its economic and spiritual functions that is instructive and stimulating, and if this were a true picture of the normal family we should have no fear for the future of the State. But we cannot be blind to the fact of the decay of family life in the best sense which went to the making of good citizenship. If under altered social and economic conditions the family has failed to perform its functions, other agencies must be invoked. Many functions are now performed by collectivist effort which were once performed—and inefficiently performed if performed at all—by the individual householder; but no one would dream of going back

1 *The Family.* By Helen Bosanquet. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1906.

to the good old days when each paterfamilias was left, for instance, to pave, sweep and water the little piece of roadway in front of his house. The housewife who is tumbling over her untidy children in her daily household duties and keeps her temper withall, is no doubt a pretty picture in maternal affection, but the family would certainly gain both spiritually and economically if the children were being properly trained during those hours when the mother is otherwise occupied. It must be patent to all that with advancing civilisation the family is unable to satisfy the increasing demands of its members. At the same time we do not underrate its vast importance in the social structure. It remains a unit and may still remain a unit, although in some aspects of diminishing importance. In her treatment of the ancient family, with which half the work is concerned, Mrs. Bosanquet gives us the results of the latest research in this most interesting study of humanity. She rejects the theory of "group-marriage" upon what appears to us to be insufficient grounds, and she argues with much ingenuity against the hypothesis of the matriarchal family, omitting by the way any reference to McClennan, and accepts the theory of the patriarchal family as succeeding to chaos as the last word. Discussion of the family in relation to industry, property and the State is followed by an historical account of the family and the State in England, and of the rise of the younger brothers and its influence on democracy. Then we have the basis of the modern family explained, together with its economic function and psychology, followed by descriptions of its constituent parts. Mrs. Bosanquet is fully alive to the desirability, nay the necessity of encouraging the woman to find outlets for her energies outside the home, but, somewhat inconsistently, would restrain her from any official participation in public affairs. Within the home the husband influences the wife and outside the husband is influenced by the wife. Therefore she argues woman should not exercise the franchise, since she is represented by her husband, to whom the State looks as the representative of the family. But since the State recognises the claims of the bachelor lodger, this argument breaks down, and it is further open to the answer that the best method of inducing woman to take an interest in municipal and national affairs is to give her the franchise. In spite of our disagreement with many of Mrs. Bosanquet's views, it must not be assumed that we have anything but admiration for this work as a whole. Whether a woman's intellect is never of the highest order, says Mrs. Bosanquet, it is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain that it may not with proper education be as fully developed as that of the average man. Even admitting the first proposition, we have no hesitation in saying that in Mrs. Bosanquet's case it is of a very high order indeed, which will stand comparison with that of most male writers.

The Wheel of Wealth, being a Reconstruction of the Science and Art of Political Economy on the Lines of Modern Evolution,[1] by Mr. John Beattie Crozier, forms the fourth volume of this writer's *History of Intellectual Development on the Lines of Modern Evolution*. At the same time it forms a complete work in itself. To reconstruct the Science of Political Economy is an ambitious task and one which should tax to the uttermost the skill of the greatest living expert in the "dreary science," as it has been called. Mr. Crozier, however, is no believer in the expert. He evidently thinks that the outsider sees most of the game, and accordingly he devotes his opening chapter to the "dangers of specialism." "From the time of Comte, Guizot, Carlyle and Emerson, down to that of Buckle, Renan and Taine," he writes, "the general thinker has been gradually falling into disrepute in literary and academic circles, until with the deaths of Lecky, Sir Leslie Stephen and Herbert Spencer, we may say that, except perhaps in the French Academy, he has become practically extinct." No doubt this is largely true. No doubt the general thinker of the type mentioned is "being elbowed out by the novelists, the magazine writers, the preachers and the Press on the one hand, and by the academicals and 'specialists' on the other." But we must remind Mr. Crozier that much of the work of the great philosophers is being done by great publicists like Frederic Harrison, James Bryce, Sir Frederick Pollock, and eminent journalists, of whom the late William Arnold was a conspicuous instance. Immense though the contributions to the progress of thought of the great philosophers have been they were not infallible. Even a philosopher is not omniscient, and instances are not wanting in which their theories have been a hindrance rather than a help to the advance of civilisation. Mr. Crozier draws too strongly upon our belief in his infallibility when he asserts of the academical economists that after they have had the science in their hands for a century or more, "literally not one of their fundamental propositions or deductions is true, and that most of their practical conclusions are false." Mr. Crozier is a Free Trader, but—he is a stricter Protectionist than even "the hardiest and most thorough-going Protectionist." His argument is shortly this. Until the millenium of Free Trade arrives each nation must act as if no other nation existed, and must at all costs protect all its *instruments of production*—lands, mines, natural products, special manufacturing capabilities, facilities for transport or what not. The world-wide empires of the past and of the present have conferred upon their subject nations *complementary* rather than competitive ideas. Where they have attempted to impose for instance their com-

[1] *The Wheel of Wealth.* Being a Reconstruction of the Science and Art of Political Economy on the Lines of Modern Evolution. By John Beattie Crozier. London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green & Co. 1906.

petitive religious ideas they have failed, and since economic ideas are analogous to religious ideas, they have failed where they attempted to impose the former. Just as the maintenance of their religious ideas are essential to the preservation of each nation's peculiar nationality and civilisation, so is the protection of its own peculiar economic conditions and the nation which concedes the 'open door' invites its own economic destruction. We need scarcely say that this argument is advanced with all Mr. Crozier's dialectical skill, but he appears to us to commit the fault of which he accuses the economists, that of omitting the factors which tell against his argument. No nation, for instance, can conduct its affairs as if it alone existed upon the face of the globe or shut itself up in a water-sealed compartment. Moreover, the whole tendency of the world is in the direction of cosmopoliticism. The interchange of ideas is the characteristic of the modern world of the West and has even invaded the Far East. The dormant *instruments of production*, which Mr. Crozier wants to see protected could be brought into use much more effectively by alterations in our municipal laws than by a system of Protection, however skilfully elaborated. It is not more Protection we want, but readier access. Mr. Crozier's argument is specious, but it has been refuted over and over again, not merely by the academical economists but by the practical economists, the captains of industry. We have never met a Protectionist yet, even of the most patriotic type, who did not, when it suited his pocket, buy in the cheapest market, quite regardless of the fact that his purchase was "made in Germany" or elsewhere. On other subjects Mr. Crozier appears to us to stand on surer ground. In his chapter on interest he shows the monopoly which the capitalist and money-lender possess, and the fallacy of the so-called freedom of contract, and indicates his approval of State supplying the capital for industrial operations. Whatever view may be taken on these and other controversial topics treated by Mr. Crozier, this work cannot be overlooked by the economist or politician. It contains the most original defence of Protection we have seen, and, apart from this subject, will be read by all classes for its wide survey of human affairs, its profound thought and philosophic treatment.

Professor Shield Nicholson is one of the "academical economists" of whom Mr. Crozier has so poor an opinion. Nevertheless, this eminent writer's latest work, *The Relations of Rents, Wages and Profits in Agriculture, and their Bearing on Rural Depopulation*,[1] will be warmly welcomed by those interested in the Land Tenure Bill of the Government, and in the question of the hour—rural depopulation. In his wide survey of rents from the date of the Conquest,

[1] *The Relations of Rent, Wages, and Profits in Agriculture, and their Bearing on Rura Depopulation.* By J. S. Nicholson, M.A., D.Sc. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., Ltd. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1906.

Professor Nicholson disagrees with Thorold Rogers, and considers that, on the whole, the tenant-farmer has had nothing to complain of at the hands of the landowner. He also points out how beneficial to agriculture and the nation were the various great Enclosure Acts. This cannot be disputed, but on the other hand neither can the injustice to the commoners be overlooked. In the matter of land-grabbing, for it was nothing else, the landowners of mediæval and modern times cannot be acquitted of the most unblushing rapacity. Upon the condition of the labourer during the same period, the Professor writes with sympathy tempered with knowledge. Absolutely there has, with some few exceptions, been no rural depopulation. He is not in favour of the "Back to the Land" cry, but he advocates a return to the mediæval system of the "land and stock lease," resembling somewhat the Continental metayer system, and the American share system.

Mr. John Ashton's *The Dawn of the XIXth Century in England: a Social Sketch of the Times*[1] has now reached a fifth edition, which is evidence at any rate of the popularity of the subject. We cannot, however, say that we are much impressed with Mr. Ashton's method of treatment, neither do we agree with the expressions of Mr. Ashton's own opinions where he compares modern women with the ladies of the Georgian period, to the disadvantage of the former. Such a book could not fail to be interesting, but we cannot help feeling that it might have been made one of the most fascinating literary productions of the day.

No apology is required, and indeed none is offered, for the appearance of *Canada To-Day*,[2] by Mr. J. A. Hobson, which is a record of this eminent economist of his impressions of Canadian politics gathered during his recent tour through the great Dominion. If Mr. Hobson is correct, Canada will become in the near future a kingdom within the Empire if we so will, but outside if we persist in holding her in leading-strings, and without any voice in foreign affairs. Although many Canadian business men and politicians favour political and economic schemes for the unification of the Empire, Mr. Hobson is confident that they would reject any scheme which curtailed their present independence, or increased Canada's responsibilities. The most striking note in Canadian politics is the powerful and growing spirit of Canadian nationality. The weakness of Canada and the danger to her democracy is the power of her great corporations like the Canadian Pacific Railway. Both Canadians and Britishers will do well to take Mr. Hobson's criticisms to heart.

The object of Mr. W. Frank Hatheway in *Canadian*

1 *The Dawn of the XIXth Century in England.* A Social Sketch of the Times. By John Ashton. With 114 Illustrations. Drawn by the Author from Contemporary Engravings. Fifth Edition. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1906.

2 *Canada To-Day.* By J. A. Hobson, M.A. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1906.

Nationality: The Cry of Labour, and other Essays,[1] is to sound the dominant note in Canadian nationality, to rouse a national patriotism founded on religious love and trust in the Creator, and an appreciation of natural surroundings and a reverence for citizenship. In a number of beautiful essays Mr. Hatheway seeks to prove that Canada possesses as many beauty spots as the old world. So far as natural beauty is concerned we agree, but surely the chief charm of travel in the old world is the association with the past which are connected with its famous places. Under the title of the *Cry of Labour* Mr. Hatheway discusses the position of the labourer and the unequal distribution of wealth. Is, asks Mr. Hatheway, a clean, healthy, good social life to arise, or are we to experience a battle or Armageddon, a second French reign of Terror? He is quite alive to the danger to democracy pointed out by Mr. Hobson, and which is not peculiar to Canada.

Those interested in local government will do well to consult the *Annual Report of the Hertfordshire County Council for the year* 1905,[2] by Mr. Francis E. Freemantle, County Medical Officer of Health.

We have received the following official publications, viz.: *Statistik des Unterrichtswesens der Haupstadt Budapest für die Jahre* 1895–96—1899–1900, *Part XXXIV.*[3] and *Die Storblickkeit der Haupt-und Residenzstadt Budapest in den Jahren* 1901–1905 *und veren Ursachen, Part XXXVI.*,[4] by Dr. Joseph v. Körösy, director of the Municipal Statistical Bureau; *Statistiches Jahrbuch der Haupt-und Residenzstadt Budapest, VII. Jahrgang* 1904,[5] edited by Professor Dr. Gustave Thirring, vice-director of the Municipal Statistical Bureau; *Statistica Giudiziaria Penale per L'Anno* 1902[6]; *Handbook of the Law relating to State Education and State School Teachers,* 1905,[7] issued by the Education Department, Victoria, Australia; *Report of the Minister of Public Instruction for the year* 1904–5,[8] presented to both Houses of Parliament of

[1] *Canadian Nationality.* The Cry of Labour and other Essays. By W. Frank Hatheway, St. John, N.B., Canada. Toronto: William Briggs. 1906.

[2] *Annual Report of the Medical Officer of Health for Hertfordshire for the Year 1905.* By Francis E. Freemantle, M.A., M.B., M.Ch. (Oxon.), M.R.C.P., F,R.C.S. Hertford: County Council.

[3] *Statistik des Unterrichtswesens der Hauptstadt Budapest für die Jahre 1895–96—1899–1900.* Von Dr. Josef v. Körösy. Berlin: Puttkammer & Mühlbricht. 1906.

[4] *Die Stirblichkeit der Haupt-und Residenzstadt Budapest in den Jahren 1901–1905 und veren Ursachen.* Von Dr. Joseph v. Körösy. Berlin: Puttkammer & Mühlbrecht. 1906.

[5] *Statistiches Jahrbuch der Haupt-und Residenzstadt Budapest, VII. Jahrgang 1904.* Redigirt von Prof. Dr. Gustave Thirring. Budapest: Communal-Statistisches Bureau. Berlin: Puttkammer & Mühlbrecht. 1906.

[6] *Statistica Giudiziaria Penale por L'Anno 1902.* Rome: Tipograph di G. Bertero. 1905.

[7] *Handbook of the Law relating to State Education and State School Teachers, 1905.* Melbourne: Robert S. Brain.

[8] *Report of the Minister of Public Instruction for the Year 1904–5.* Melbourne: Robert S. Brain.

Victoria; *Boletin de Instruccion Publica,*[1] Nos. 7 and 9 of Vol. V., and No. 1 of Vol. VI. No. 9 contains photos of some superb ecclesiastical decorative architecture.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

The fifth and concluding volume of *A History of Modern England,*[2] by Mr. Herbert Paul, opens with Lord Salisbury's first invitation to form a Ministry, and ends with the defeat of Lord Rosebery's Administration in 1895. It is not at all clear to us why Mr. Paul has not carried his history down to 1905, that *annus mirabilis* in the fortunes of the Progressive Liberalism. The disasters of that party at the General Election of 1895 is attributed by him to most of the items in the Newcastle programme,—Church Disestablishment in Wales and Scotland, Mr. Gladstone's suggestion that Egypt should be evacuated, and the proposals for Local Veto. The elector "was thinking of his business and his beer. He did not want the Irish to interfere with the one or the teetotalers with the other." Mr. Paul is to be congratulated on having brought his work to a close. As literature it may hope to live, but as history—using that term in its wider connotation—it must, in course of time, be superseded when the memoirs of certain statesmen still amongst us come to be written, and the inner springs of action, now hidden from our gaze and his, are revealed. The author, whose political views are no secret, has been at commendable pains to do justice to friends and foes alike.

Mr. Denton J. Snider, in *The American Ten Years' War* (1855–1865),[3] divides his subject into three parts: (I.) (1855–6) when, without open proclamation of war, 5,000 men from Missouri marched into the neighbouring State of Kansas; (II.) The chasm between North and South widening and deepening after its apparent closing-up through the election of Buchanan (1858–61); (III.) The Great War in its final stage still working out the problem as to whether this Union is to continue to be the parent of both slave States and free States, or of free States only. Mr. Snider treats this Titanic conflict from a purely transcendental standpoint: no blare of trum-

1 *Boletin de Instruccion Publica Organo de la Secretaria del Ramo.* Vol. V., Num. 7 and 9; Vol. VI., Num. 1. Mexico: Tipografia Economica. 1906.

2 *A History of Modern England.* By Herbert Paul. Vol. V. London: Macmillan and Co.

3 *The American Ten Years' War (1855–1865).* By Denton J. Snider. St. Louis Sigma Publishing Co.

pets, no beating of drums, clash of arms, or sanguinary battle-scenes does he evoke in his pages.

In *Red Rubber*,[1] Mr. E. D. Morel, who is the author of numerous books on Africa, formulates a scathing indictment against the abominations, in some cases unspeakable, of the rubber and ivory trade as pursued by the Belgians on the banks of the Congo, for the private profit of King Leopold II. and some of his associates. At first, as Sir Harry H. Johnson shows in his *Introduction*, the Baptist missionaries of England and America ranged themselves on the side of the Congo Free State, of which, at the present time, they are its most bitter opponents. By a new law, any missionary reporting an outrage committed by a white man is liable to be tried for defamation and sentenced to five years' imprisonment. Now, although a year has elapsed since the publication of the Commissioners' Report, King Leopold (whose "conscience seems obdurated against evidence, against shame, against the terror of an immortality of bad renown") has not swept away the system of thinly-disguised slavery condemned in that document, but continues to divert the Crown-lands by, in fact, all natural resources to his own selfish ends. Mr. Morel has undoubtedly a strong case, but he weakens it somewhat by an exhibition of sectarian animosity. To remedy the evils which he and all right-minded men deplore, he urges the establishment of British Consular jurisdiction on the Congo, and that an International Conference, to be held at Berlin or the Hague, should be summoned, and the Congo State remodelled by its original creators. Unless drastic reforms are carried out soon, there is danger of the negroes uniting against the white race. The book contains two maps showing (1) the proportionate area covered by the Congo River and its affluents, (2) the revenue divisions of the Congo Free State.

The joint punitive action of England, Germany, and Italy against Venezuela, provoked from Dr. Drago, Argentine Minister for Foreign Affairs, a Note, addressed in December 1902, to the Argentine Minister in Washington, of protest against armed intervention on behalf of contracts between a nation and individuals. The United States received it coldly, for such a method of debt-collecting is not opposed to the Monroe doctrine, provided that no annexation of South American territory be contemplated. In view of the forthcoming Pan-American Congress at Rio de Janeiro, Dr. Drago has amplified his protest with considerable ability in *Cobro coercitivo de deudas públicas*.[2]

[1] *Red Rubber*. The Story of the Rubber Slave Trade flourishing on the Congo in the Year of Grace 1906. By E. D. Morel. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

[2] *Cobro coercitivo de deudas públicas*. Por Dr. Luis M. Drago. Buenos Aires: Coni Hermanos.

BELLES LETTRES.

In *Man's Blood-Guilt*,[1] Mr. Robert Ballard has endeavoured to prove, by a system of psychology peculiarly his own, two highly disputable propositions which he regards as mutually dependent, viz., (1) the unlawfulness of a flesh diet; (2) the supremacy of woman. In respect of the former, to quote his own words, "Assuming that all mammals are human soul-holders in various stages of development or degradation, their blood may justly be viewed as the blood of man, and the fiat, 'Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed,' becomes deeply significant." Human war is one of the retributions meted out to the "murderer of mammals. . . . By woman's secession from the ranks of flesh-eaters, she will strike the death-knell of the butcher's loathsome trade. Subject though she may still be to the supremacy of man, the influence of woman will surely turn the scale."

Un Mirage,[2] by M. Jean de la Brète, is a French version of Enoch Arden. In Tennyson's poem Enoch quietly disappears; in the variant before us, he becomes, under an assumed name, the honoured guest in Philip's house, and falls in love with the latter's sister-in-law whilst engaged in arguing her out of certain pantheistic views into something like orthodox Catholicism. It is hardly an attractive story, and, as a lay-missioner, Enoch bores us with his melancholy countenance and controversial platitudes.

Schoolboys, no less than their parents, will appreciate the delightful humour of *Cox's Cough-Drops*,[3] by Mr. R. S. Warren Bell. Given two boys, the one an aristocrat and the other a plebeian, yet both resembling each other so closely that the only distinguishing feature is a wart on the hand of the heir to old Cox's millions, we have all the materials for a sequence of diverting situations, and the author has not failed to make the best use of them. Young Cox might be described as an unlicked cub who bullies Lord Yarningale into personating him whenever, by so doing, the former may evade a punishment or obtain a pleasure. The book, which is illustrated by Mr. J. R. Skelton, is well suited for a Christmas present.

Mr. George Manville Fenn has written many readable novels, but, judging from *The Traitors' Gait and other Stories*[4] his talent does not lie in the direction of short tales. As a cavalier story *The Traitors' Gait* is unconvincing, and of the remaining ten

1 *Man's Blood-Guilt.* By Robert Ballard. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co.
2 *Un Mirage.* Par Jean de la Brète. Paris: Librairie Plon.
3 *Cox's Cough-Drops.* By R. S. Warren Bell. Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith.
4 *The Traitors' Gait and other Stories.* By George Manville Fenn. London: Digby, Long & Co.

Between Two Patients is the only one to which we feel justified in according even moderate praise.

The Vicar of Dale End,[1] by Mrs. de Courcy Laffan, is the story of a scholarly north country parson, idolised by his flock, who, to save his beloved wife and child from sorrow and disgrace, sinned deeply and subsequently repented. But the burden of his sin was not brought home to his conscience until long after he had wrecked two young lives by suffering an innocent man to die a felon's death for a crime which he himself had committed. Although certain of its episodes are pathetic in their tragic intensity, nevertheless the story, as a whole, is stagey rather than dramatic. It appealed, however, to the late Sir Henry Irving, who accepted the dedication of it.

A woman is rescued from a raft in mid-ocean, forgets her identity, but falls in love, after the convention pattern, with her rescuer, and the pair become engaged. Soon afterwards a certain officer comes upon the scene, and recognises her as his *fiancée*, but his prior claim is disputed, whereupon the rejected one has recourse to a series of unworthy artifices to obtain possession of her. Such, in brief, is the plot of *My Atlantic Bride*,[2] by Mr. Herbert Russell, which is a dull production, notwithstanding the extravagance of its plot, and the sensational nature of certain of its incidents.

For the Honour of his House[3] deals with the fortunes of Sir Rupert Marston, who, when found amongst the rebels after the Battle of Sedgmoor, is straightway hanged, but cut down, in the very nick of time, by a pretty girl who subsequently turns out to be his cousin by a *mésalliance*. Mr. Barton Baker has evidently been at pains to familiarise himself with seventeenth-century London. He has also introduced into this romance of the English Revolution the starveling poet Nathaniel Lee, Rochester, and most of the intriguing crowd that flocked to the Court of James II. Cavaliers, Anabaptists, and Papists—the last-named invariably represented in a sinister light—continually cross and recross the stage in picturesque medley. Hero and heroine bear a charmed life, and there is no lack of exciting episodes. We have read better, and also many much worse, attempts on the part of latter-day novelists to deal with the period in question.

Students of old customs and superstitions should be grateful to Mr. N. W. Thomas for the *Bibliography of Folk-Lore*, 1905,[4] which he has carefully compiled for the Council of the Folk-Lore Society. The brochure in question contains 404 references to works and periodicals published in the British Empire.

[1] *The Vicar of Dale End.* By Mrs. de Courcy Laffan (Mrs. Leith Adams). London Digby, Long & Co.

[2] *My Atlantic Bride.* By Herbert Russell. London: Digby, Long & Co.

[3] *For the Honour of his House.* By Barton Baker. London: Digby, Long & Co.

[4] *Bibliography of Folk-Lore, 1905.* Compiled by N. W. Thomas. London: David Nutt.

The *Diaries*[1] for 1907 published by Messrs. de La Rue and Co. are in every respect up to their usual high standard of excellence. They are made in numerous sizes and shapes, suitable for all kinds of pockets; and the ladies, who as a rule have no pockets, have been considerately catered for. Some of the Diaries combine purse or card-case, or both, and are most beautifully bound in Russian leather, sealskin, &c. Any of them would make most welcome Christmas and New Year presents. The Travellers' Index Diary is the most perfect of its kind, and the vast amount of information it contains will be found highly useful even to those who do not "travel." These Indexes are a speciality of this well-known firm.

It is always satisfactory to know that one can find a note-book whose binding will be as firm at the end of a year's usage as it was at the beginning. Such is the case with *Letts' Original Diaries*,[2] each containing a £1000 Insurance Coupon, which are printed on the best paper, and contain a great deal of useful information, as well as ample space for writing. These diaries cover a wide range, from the large *Office*, *Scribbling*, and *Desk* diaries to those for the pocket. Their Housekeeper's Account Books are so well known that it is hardly necessary to mention them.

Other popular *Diaries*[3] are those issued by Messrs. Walker and Co., from whose list, choice of size and binding can easily be made. One of their specialities is the set of pages at the beginning of each book, enabling one to see a month's engagements at a glance. Another excellent speciality is their Graphic Diary, with its welcome bold dates for busy workers and tired eyes.

The enormous selection of Christmas and New Year Cards and Calendars submitted by Messrs. Raphael Tuck and Co.,[4] comprising about 4000 different designs, testifies to their indefatigable energy and enterprise. Special mention must be made of the art portfolio calendars, boxed cards, and the hand-painted series of greeting cards. Many of the calendars are beautiful reproductions of works of art, and the increase in the size of the dates is most satisfactory.

A novelty which is sure to meet with the great popularity it deserves is the series of indestructible nursery mats of washable calico, printed in colours illustrating the alphabet, nursery rhymes, birds, &c. They can be used to decorate the walls, or as cot or table covers. The same idea is applied to the linen toy books, which can be easily washed after taking out the boards.

Much to the joy of the "young ones," *Father Tuck's Annual*[5] has double the number of pages that it had in previous years.

[1] *Diaries and Calendars for 1907.* London: De la Rue & Co.
[2] *Letts' Original Diaries for 1907.* London: Cassell & Co.
[3] *Diaries and Calendars for 1907.* London: Walker & Co.
[4] *Cards, Calendars, Post Cards, Masks, &c.* London: Raphael Tuck & Sons.
[5] *Father Tuck's Annual.* Edited by Eric. London: Raphael Tuck & Sons.

Paul Bourget stands in the front rank of contemporary European novelists; among his countrymen there are only Anatole France and Pierre Loti to dispute his supremacy. The brilliant author of *le Disciple*, *Cosmopolis*, *l'Etape*, &c., is, however, a psychologist and critic of the first order, who, up to the publication of his *Essais de Psychologie*, made fiction the exponent of his philosophy. In the first part of the series of *Etudes et Portraits* he discusses certain questions which are political in the broader sense of the term as used by Aristotle. These studies are designed simply as contributions to the doctrine of traditionalism, which he has held at first by instinct, afterwards by conviction, ever since he began to write. His most interesting essays in this group are *de la vraie Méthode Scientifique* and *La Politique de Balzac*. Much that he has written here will give grave offence to the party now dominant in France, for, after submitting them to an exhaustive analysis, he refutes with inexorable logic many of the most cherished shibboleths of the Revolution—the windy fallacies on which its structure rests. In the second part, under *Romanciers et Poëtes*, we find a whole gallery of portraits: Sainte Beuve as a poet, Heine and Alfred de Musset, Guy de Maupassant, and, last of a long series, Pierre Loti in the Holy Land, whither, as his *Le Désert* and *Jérusalem* show, he had journeyed in vain quest of recovering a faith which he hoped was merely dormant, but which, to his grief, he found to be dead. In *Sociologie et Littérature*[1] M. Paul Bourget has achieved a work that, although on a smaller scale, may challenge comparison with *Les Causeries de Lundi*.

In *Seven Nights in a Gondola*,[2] Mr. Lucas Cleeve carries us to an idealised Venice unvulgarised by steamboats or cheap trippers, and yet of the present day. Both abominations, of course, exist, but here they are not obtruded on our notice. Neither Louis Mallory, the artist eager for impressions, nor Joan Bevington, the fair *châtelaine* of Casa Braccia—beings which fate mysteriously brought together, night after night, on the lagoon—can be mistaken for types of twentieth-century conventionality. In reading the story of their love, we irresistibly call to mind certain stanzas of *A Toccata of Galuppi*:

> "Did young people take their pleasure when the sea was warm in May?
> When they made up fresh adventures for the morrow, do you say?"

And if "balls and masks" are lacking we have, in compensation, a figure that might well serve to complete Browning's word-picture. This is Graziosa, the artist's model, like unto his "dear, dead women with such hair too, what became of all the gold used to hang and brush their bosoms?" Very subtly does the author describe

[1] *Sociologie et Littérature.* Par Paul Bourget. Paris: Librairie-Plon.
[2] *Seven Nights in a Gondola.* By Lucas Cleeve. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

the various stages of a courtship begun, on the part of the man, in idleness, and pursued for a while in a spirt of intrigue, but which ended happily in a true union of hearts. *Seven Nights in a Gondola* is the prettiest romance we have read for many a long day.

The immortal epics of Homer and Virgil acquire a fresh charm when transmuted into the choice but simple prose of Mr. A. J. Church, who, in *The Children's Odyssey*,[1] has provided a fitting companion volume to his *Stories of the Iliad and the Æneid.* Although written rather with a view to recreation than instruction, works of this nature possess a distinct educational value, inasmuch as they must kindle in the minds of intelligent youth a desire to read these old-world stories in the original texts. Too long have schoolmasters been suffered to make the study of the Greek and Latin classics a torture to the young by a premature insistence on the necessity of a minute acquaintance with the niceties of grammar. Under such a process of dissection even a living language must become "dead" so far as its spirit is concerned. Twelve coloured plates that are reproductions of contemporary archaic art serve to illustrate the narrative, which begins with the Cyclops and ends with the peace between Ulysses and his people.

POETRY.

There are three Sordellos in the field of literature: (1) The Sordello to whom there are eight references in Dante's *Purgatorio;* (2) the semi-mythical Sordello of the chronicles of the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries; (3) the Sordello of Browning's poem, but whose portrait that poet sketched for us in his first published work, "Pauline." According to Professor Sonnenschein, "All that is known of the real Sordello is that he was a troubadour of the thirteenth century mentioned by his contemporary Rolandin, who states that he eloped with Cuniza, wife of Count Richard de S. Bonifazio, and sister of Ezzolino da Romano." *Browning's Sordello: A Commentary*,[2] by Mr. K. M. Loudon, should prove very serviceable to all students of that obscure and difficult poem, which, in its first three books, is, in Mr. Stopford Brooke's opinion, mainly autobiographical. The work has been well and succinctly done, and no attempt is made to evade difficulties. It is an admirable addition to the *Bijou Series.*

[1] *The Children's Odyssey.* By the Rev. Alfred J. Church, M.A London: Seleey and Co.

[2] *Browning's Sordello.* A Commentary. By K. M. Loudon London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.

ART.

A most serious and substantial art-book is the folio volume of more than 350 pages by M. Pierre Marcel on "French Painting at the beginning of the eighteenth century (1690–1721)"[1] This is the period from the last of Le Brun and his contemporaries to the end of Watteau, comprising such names as Coypel, Jean Bérain, Lancret, Largillière, and Hyacinthe Rigaud. A first part explains the history of the period, administration, and national and foreign influences. The second part describes the families of artists—art running in families—art training, social situation of painters, with much about their personalities. The third takes up the various kinds of painting of the age, religious, mythological, ancient and contemporary history and battles; landscape and animals; portrait and *genre*, these two being the triumph of the French art of the day. The historical part is minute and beyond all praise in its complete list of painters and bibliography, with indexes of proper names and works. Printing and reproductions are excellent, on good paper, while the fourteen inset plates are unusually fine, especially in their reproduction of drawings.

A happy experiment is the appearance in English of a number of *Japanese Treasure Tales*,[2] with very well-chosen and artistic illustrations taken from Japanese ivories, bronzes, iron sword-guards, pouch mountings, wooden netsukés. The author clearly describes these stories as "explanations of the incidents which occur so frequently in the art treasures of Japan." Apart from valid artistic reasons, it is important that true knowledge of Japan should be disseminated in England. From the story of Ono-No-Komachi (9th century, A.D.), who left hundreds of poems, we may extract the following verses:

> "While I was revelling
> In the thought of my beauty,
> The bloom of my youth
> Has faded away."

"She is as lovely as Komachi," is the highest expression of admiration for a beautiful woman, even at the present day—and the lesson is surely not worn out with the centuries.

[1] *La Peinture Française (1690–1721).* Par Pierre Marcel. Paris: Ancienne Maison Quantin.

[2] *Japanese Treasure Tales.* By Kumasaku Tomita and G. Ambrose Lee. With 37 Illustrations. London: Yamanaka & Co.

DATE ISSUED	DATE DUE	DATE ISSUED	DATE DUE